

VOL. XX

OCTOBER, 1943

No. 4

THE AUSTRALASIAN Catholic Record

FOR CLERGY
AND RELIGIOUS.



Editor: RIGHT REV. E. J. O'DONNELL, D.D.

St. Columba's College, Springwood.

Manager: REV. R. B. COUGHLAN.

St. Patrick's College, Manly.

*The Official Organ for communications issued by the
Apostolic Delegate to Australasia.*

Announcements

CORRESPONDENCE: All correspondence should be addressed to the Editor, St. Patrick's College, Manly, N.S.W.

Queries relating to S. Scripture, Moral Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, or any subject of professional interest, are cordially invited.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—Price: single copy, 3/6; yearly, *in advance*, 12/-:

Remittances should be sent to the Manager or the Diocesan Collector, either by postal order or cheque (with exchange added).

The clergy of each diocese are invited to appoint one of their number to collect and forward their annual subscriptions.

The following priests have been appointed to act as collectors and representatives for the *Australasian Catholic Record* in their respective dioceses:—

Archdiocese of Sydney—A.C. Record Staff.

Archdiocese of Perth—Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., South Perth, W.A.

Archdiocese of Wellington—Rev. W. J. Walsh, Opunake, N.Z.

Archdiocese of Adelaide—Rev. D. O'Connell, Murray Bridge, S.A.

Archdiocese of Brisbane—Rev. B. Bolton, P.P., Kelvin Grove, Q.

Archdiocese of Hobart—Rev. J. Wallis, Hobart, Tasmania.

Diocese of Armidale—Rev. M. Tully, Adm., Armidale, N.S.W.

Diocese of Auckland—Rev. L. Buxton, D.C.L., M.A., Auckland, N.Z.

Diocese of Ballarat—Rev. J. P. Walsh, St. Arnaud, Vic.

Diocese of Bathurst—Rev. M. J. Dunne, Bathurst, N.S.W.

Diocese of Dunedin—Rev. C. J. Collins, P.P., Forbury, N.Z.

Diocese of Goulburn—Rev. J. Blakeney, Goulburn, N.S.W.

Diocese of Lismore—Very Rev. T. Morris, Smithtown, N.S.W.

Diocese of Maitland—Very Rev. P. C. McCormack, P.P., Singleton, N.S.W.

Diocese of Port Augusta—Very Rev. W. P. Kain, Pekina, S.A.

Diocese of Rockhampton—Rev. M. J. Dolan, Adm., Rockhampton, Q.

Diocese of Sale—Rev. J. Fitzpatrick, Cowwarr, Vic.

*Diocese of Sandhurst—

Diocese of Toowoomba—Rev. J. Madden, D.D., Toowoomba, Q.

Diocese of Wagga—Rev. P. Gahan, Coolamon, N.S.W.

Diocese of Wilcannia-Forbes—Very Rev. Dean J. Sexton, V.F., Nyngan, N.S.W.

Diocese of Townsville—Very Rev. K. J. H. Kelly, D.D., Ayr, Q.

Diocese of Geraldton—Rev. Bryan Gallagher, Ph.D., Geraldton, W.A.

The Australasian Catholic Record

A Quarterly Publication under Ecclesiastical Sanction

"Pro Ecclesia Dei." St. Augustine.

Contents:

APOSTLES OF TO-MORROW,
Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D. 205

THE BEVERIDGE REPORT AND PLAN,
Rev. W. Keane, S.J. 217

IN DIEBUS ILLIS IV. John O'Brien 238

MORAL THEOLOGY AND CANON LAW,
Rt. Rev. J. J. Nevin, D.D., D.C.L. 258

Purposely confessing to deaf priest; obligation of hearing Mass outside Sunday; doing laundry on Sunday—Penal servitude does not excuse from restitution—Is Catholic undertaker justified in arranging cremations?—Two persons invalidly married living as brother and sister, can Sacraments be given them?

LITURGY Rev. J. Carroll, D.C.L. 269
Dedication of a church to a beatified; cult permitted to a beatified

BOOK REVIEWS 273

Christ's Homeland (Rev. D. Riordan, P.P.)

Soul Clinic. (Two Sisters of Notre Dame).


Christianity in Daily Life (Rev. H. V. Gill, S.J.)

Nihil Obstat :

RICHARDUS COLLENDER,

CENSOR DEPUTATUS.

Imprimatur :

 NORMANNUS,

ARCHIEP. SYDNEYENSIS.

Apostles of To-Morrow

I. THE SCHOOLS ARE NURSERIES OF CATHOLIC ACTION.

"Catholic Action must consist of two things; it must have two phases, not necessarily successive ones, namely, formation and action. Catholic Action must have as its preliminary the individual sanctification of each of its members, so that the supernatural life abounds and super-abounds within them. But after this element of formation comes the second, the distribution of this life, the Action of the Apostolate."

—Pope Pius XI. to the Catholic Associations of Rome, 1931.

Christ Calls For Action.

Christ, the Master Catechist, teaches us by word and example that holiness of life is acquired through action. Listen to His words:

"Not he that sayeth Lord, Lord, shall enter into the Kingdom of Heaven;

"But he who *doeth* the Will of My Father."

"Be ye *doers* of the word and not hearers only."

"If you know these things you shall be blessed if you *do* them."

In His own words we pray each day:

"Thy will be done on earth as it is in Heaven."

The happiness of Heaven is a joyous activity, doing the will of God without any of the shortcomings of our clinging clay. "Thy will be done on earth" means that it is to be done by me, worked out by me here and now in whatever place and circumstances I may be in. "To do" is an active verb, which calls for action. "Thy will be done" is not a sort of spiritual non-resistance, a supine acceptance of fate. To do His Will calls for an alert, dynamic life.

The Active Holiness of the Saints.

The saints alone have fully accepted that teaching by living it. In the story of every saint sanctity was slowly and painfully built up through daily acts of self discipline. A relentless activity emptied the house of its bad tenants, and in their place established the Christian virtues as permanent dwellers. As the saint acquired holiness bit by bit, he busied himself in enriching his store through active missionary efforts. The saints spent themselves in freeing those about them from the pride of life and the pursuit of pleasure.

It must be ever in our minds that Christ came on earth to make men holy. The ultimate aim of Catholic education is to make ourselves holy through teaching, and to form our children in habits of holiness.

"The greatest tragedy of our day," says Monsignor Fulton Shean in one of his radio talks, "is not the evil of dictators, the prostitution of treaties, the bombing of open cities, the sneak attacks on other nations; these indeed are terrible—but the greatest tragedy of our day is that we have no saints. To-day we need a counter-revolution whose violence is directed against self rather than against one's neighbours. In revolutions the other fellow is always wrong; in counter-revolutions we are wrong, the reform starts with ourselves. The violence of counter-revolution wars against selfishness and the lust of one's individual self which would, if unleashed, make revolutionists of us all. It is just this weapon that all great reformers in the past have used. Ignatius of Loyola bent the intellect to the service of truth. Charles Borromeo joined the Cardinalate with saintliness. Phillip Neri revived a love for the poor and down-trodden in the parishes of Rome. Teresa of Avila rescued the contemplative from the glamour of the world and placed it under the shadow of the Cross where saints are made. Francis de Sales, the gentleman-saint, entered the lion's den of Geneva and converted where Bossuet only thrilled. Francis Xavier taught black and yellow hands to lift up white Hosts to the Trinity. Leo XIII, like a voice crying in the wilderness, proclaimed that there is no equal bargaining power when capital has all and labour nothing—hence the right to organise. Don Bosco was a social worker before the world recognized its need. The Cure of Ars, a parish priest who was a saint, proved to the world that a soul can be a parish if we have zeal. Bernadette of Lourdes was the epiphany of the child of the proletariat when the world was going mad about proletarians, but forgetting that they had immortal souls and yearning for happiness the world could not give. These were the counter-revolutionists who saved the work of yesterday. But what of to-day? Surely, if there is one prayer that should be on our lips to-day it is that God will send us saints."

The movement to-day for the canonization of three great names of the immediate past, Pope Pius X, Cardinal Newman, and G. K. Chesterton, is an indication that men's estimation is coming back to sanctity as the chief thing.

As educators we must remind ourselves that what we are striving for is such a rare thing that we cannot expect to acquire it by simply

praying for it. Prayer will give us the courage and perseverance to pay for this gift daily. But pay for it we must in the currency of self-discipline. Sanctity is an activity gained by acts within, and increased by acts without. Self denial buys virtue and apostolic action strengthens it.

Modern Education Teaches by Doing.

Modern psychology is solidly behind action methods of learning. The idea of generating thinking through doing is a very sound one. The expression of what has been impressed, applies knowledge, and stimulates more thought on the matter through the actions performed. Both as man and child we learn by doing, by action.

When we examine any movements that are successful and ask why, the answer inevitably is that success insists upon action in the learning stage, and upon action among others in the finishing-off stage. The gift or talent, the art or skill must be exercised if it would grow.

Personal sanctification is no exception, and we who would acquire it, and would lead others to do likewise, must begin by action within ourselves and continue with action among others. Surely this is the application of the parable of the talents to our present purpose. The servant who traded the five talents and gained another five is commended by his Master, whereas he who hid his Lord's money in the earth was cast out as an unprofitable servant (St. Matthew: 25, 14-30).

In the life of Christ and of His saints we learn that true holiness can never deteriorate into smug passivity. Sanctity cannot remain idle. No, either it grows through action or it withers in ease.

Parents, priests, and teachers, the educators of youth, have been slow to recognise the sound psychological principles behind Catholic Action. We have been aware of the value of action-methods, but we do not emphasize sufficiently the fact that the formation of character is achieved through this activity. It is not so much what is done by this boy or girl, but what is done to him and to her through this activity. We should stress not the activity but what will come to one through it. The activity is but the means.

To our youth must we say in season and out of season: "You are not living the full Catholic faith unless you are doing something. Unless you become apostles through action you may lose the faith. You will never really know your faith unless you try to teach it. You will never be aflame with enthusiasm for the faith unless you try to spread it. To know your faith is not enough, you must realize it, that

is, re-live it by sharing it with others. For, to-morrow, those only who actually live the faith by becoming Apostles for it, will retain it."

The lines of a modern American poet illustrate the necessity of giving to others what we have received:—

Love that is hoarded, moulds at last,
 Until we know some day
 The only thing we ever have
 Is what we give away.
 And kindness that is never used,
 But hidden all alone,
 Will slowly harden till it is
 As hard as any stone.
 It is the things we always hold
 That we will lose some day;
 The only things we ever keep
 Are what we give away."—Louis Ginsberg.

Our Schools are Nurseries of Catholic Action.

What can we do with the children, who are still at school, to educate them in the principles of Catholic Action? Can we establish a novitiate in Catholic Action among the pupils of our senior classes? When the children leave our schools Catholic Action among them depends on the enthusiasm of the parochial clergy and upon the facilities which the parish offers. The problem is then out of the hands of the teachers.

In the appendix of the Acts of the first Perth Synod (1940) it is stated:

"The call to Catholic Action is directed in a special way to Catholic Youth. The formation of the young should, therefore, be the primary consideration. In this work our Religious Teachers have a unique opportunity of rendering the most powerful assistance, for the Catholic schools are indeed the nurseries of Catholic Action."

To hail our schools as "nurseries of Catholic Action" is a happy omen. The word "nursery" brings to us the busy hum of activity. Even the moments of silence are charged with absorbed interest. On a nursery floor no child is listless or bored, because every child follows his urge to do things; off the child toddles to carry out a hint even though the hint is not fully understood. In a nursery there is action by the babes, who are encouraged to go a step further each day. Children and mother live the fact that action is the best way to learn in a

nursery. Unfortunately for us all the school gradually reduces the free activity of the nursery, and as the child mounts up the grades he becomes more and more a listener-in.

The Importance of the Parish.

The word "parish" is simply the Greek for neighbourhood, and it means a defined territory around the Church and school. The parish's importance is that it is (1) the primary unit in the hierarchical organization of the Church. It is the family unit within the diocese. The family is to the Church what a cell is to an organism.

(2) The parish is for the faithful the source of the supernatural life. The parish is the normal channel of sacramental grace. On the spiritual health of the parish unit depends the growth in holiness of the Church. Within the parish boundary criss-cross the paths of saint and sinner. Within the parish organizations are all the avenues of service which a zealous priest and an enthusiastic laity require.

(3) The parish is to the College or High School what the front line is to the army camp. In action the training is tested, and whatever weaknesses are uncovered by the stark realities of the battleground, these must be corrected and strengthened. Not to bring the lesson of experience, won so hard in actual war, to bear upon the future training of soldiers in camp would be foolishness unthinkable. Similarly in the parish life, whose church and school may be humble buildings, and whose pastor and flock may be simple and prosaic, the College and High School are tested and tried. Their highest ambition must ever be that their product may win the title of good parishioners. Religious, men and women, called to the high vocation of Catholic teaching, should watch well the parish, and listen patiently to the comments of the pastors, and they will learn much that they can apply to the children now under their charge.

(4) The parish is the final arena wherein the faith we teach in our schools is lived out, or deserted. Our past pupils, whether they amass wealth or remain poor, whether they win fame or remain hidden among the mediocrities, all of them will live in a parish, and of them their pastor has the right to demand that they live and act as good parishioners. It will be a poor compensation to the pastor if he sees our past pupils prominent on big occasions at College and Convent reunions, well in the limelight on great days for the diocese, and on the whole, remarkable for their platform attendance, while the parish

sodalities and societies, the parish activities, social and financial, know them not.

(5) The parish is important because if Catholic Action is to recruit the laity to its active ranks, that means parochial organizations.

Parish Consciousness Through Action.

Who is to educate the children still at school in parish consciousness? On the parish clergy rests the first responsibility. Too much criticism and blame has been placed upon the teachers. Admittedly the teachers could do more, but that does not excuse the parochial clergy for their inactivity in this important matter. .

How may we, the parochial clergy, direct our children while still at school to activities within the parish? I am convinced that a parish sense will never be developed except through action.

The activities which I now outline have been tried out with some success, most of them in my own parish.

Parish Finances.

Children still at school should be taught by parent, priest, and teacher to take their share of the parish financial burden. That Dad and Mother pays does not excuse the rest of the family. The school should prepare its pupils to ask themselves when they receive their first wages: what are my obligations with this money that I have earned? My first two duties are the support of my home, and the support of my parish. To encourage children's contributions there should be some way of acknowledging them.

If the pennies of the children are pooled under the family name, the children's sacrifice receives no public recognition. In quarterly lists of block collections plan a separate list for children. Special envelopes for children's offerings at Christmas and Easter, and their own list of acknowledgment, is desirable.

Children's offerings on the plate each Sunday yield valuable formation in proportion as these express personal sacrifices. A child who saves a penny for days to give at the Offertory collection is building his own character much better than the child who is handed a penny for the plate on Sunday morning.

In the good old days of parish bazaars the children caught the spirit of contributing-from-the-home excitement. The bazaar maintained the family spirit within the parish. To-day the system of direct giving is the fashion and is likely to become the rule. With the passing of the bazaar, its entertainments, its house parties and its healthy

rivalry, a valuable meeting ground also disappears. Direct-giving does not give the satisfaction of doing something, were it only the making of a plate of scones. Direct-giving feels as cold as paying the rent or other domestic bills. There is no melting-pot in the parishes where direct-giving is the rule. People come to Mass and return home again, frequently without much to say to anyone else. In the bazaar-less parishes the family spirit with its feuds, victories and defeats, is vanishing and in its place we have lists of names, many of whom are known only to the parish clergy. A time there was when everyone in the parish met regularly at entertainments, and no one could remain a stranger for long. That change has come to stay, and to meet it we must train our children while yet in school. In such instructions from no one will the children learn better than from their own pastor.

Parish Sodalties.

Pupils attending schools outside the parish need a special invitation and a gentle handling if our parochial sodalties and societies are to enrol all the children of the parish. Such children are shy; they fear they are intruding, and, sometimes, they are made feel so by the reception they receive from the teachers and pupils of the parish schools.

At their 1942 Conference the teachers of the Archdiocese of Perth, W. Australia, discussed this question at length, and passed two resolutions, as follows:

1. Day boys attending schools outside their own parish should be enrolled in the Junior Holy Name Society in their parish Church. High Schools and Colleges should not enrol any day boys in their Junior Holy Name Society. Only boarders should be eligible for membership.

2. Girls attending day schools outside the parish should be enrolled in junior sections of the Sacred Heart Sodality, or whatever other Confraternity is active among the women of the parish.

The Perth teachers recommended the age of twelve for both of these enrolments, because twelve marks the end of primary or grade education. Twelve is better than at fourteen, because twelve gives at least a two years supervised membership of such sodalties. The problems of adolescence have not begun for children at twelve, and, as a consequence, they are more tractable. The Perth teachers also recommended that the parish clergy should visit the High Schools outside the parish to invite the children to join these parochial societies. A leader in each such school is desirable, whose duty would be to remind the children before the monthly Holy Communion, and to give monthly returns to the pastor.

No matter what societies exist within the College, or High School, day pupils over twelve are to be urged to join the parish ones, and boarders are to be instructed that they should join the parish ones when they leave school. It is most desirable that all the children of the parish should meet as equals before God in a common membership in the parish sodalities. The College or High School that would foster exclusiveness in their children is doing harm to its pupils and a disservice to the Church.

The Care of the Parish Church.

The parish Church offers many avenues for action which we priests have not used enthusiastically enough. Our Churches have shrines which we could hand over to the care of a class in our school. Girls might take a month in turn to sweep and polish and decorate with flowers any shrine which the pastor nominates.

In my own parish Church we have a Guild of the Sanctuary, whose members take a month in groups of three or four to polish the pews, the rubber flooring, and to give those finishing touches which are so much appreciated by the people. Some months are taken by individual families, every member of which lends a willing hand to the polishing, usually done early on Saturday afternoon. The service of the altar can be extended to more boys so that every boy serves Mass sometime during his school days. An altar-boys' society is an incentive to tidiness and reverence on the altar.

Parish press squads provide action which appeals to boys. A pamphlet describing this work is available at the C.T.S. Another activity would be to supply holy-water to the homes in the parish. Children bring their own bottles to the homes, and empty the holy water there. This might become a special effort at Easter. Boys have done fine work under the auspices of the St. Vincent de Paul Society in bringing Catholic papers and C.T.S. pamphlets to institutions, to ships, and to the waiting rooms of doctors, dentists, and professional people. Children could easily care for the weekly calendar in the Church porch, adding to the Masses of the week any parochial function or notice which the pastor supplies.

School Mission Society.

Establish a Mission Society in the school. This is an activity whose efficacy has been amply proved by experience. Young people are naturally interested in strange people, strange places, and in adventures in foreign parts. They make heroes of missionaries, and the

lives of their heroes inspire in them a desire to do great things for the spread of the Kingdom of Christ. The following points explain what a Mission Society is:

1. Membership is entirely voluntary. No privilege (except that of working for the Church) is attached to membership. Attendance at weekly meetings, held in members' own time, is expected.

2. As far as possible members do everything themselves, under guidance. At first perhaps one of the teachers will "run" the Mission Society, but once the members see what is wanted they can do better for themselves. The teacher is then present only to guide and encourage and solve problems.

3. Writing of short papers on missions and missionaries; papers to be read at weekly meetings, or even to groups not in the Society. This requires, of course, a study of mission affairs. Regular correspondence is maintained with missionaries "in the field." Publication of school Mission Bulletins.

4. Recruiting campaigns for members for A.P.F. or Holy Childhood, and also for the Mission Society itself.

5. Organisation of "shows" to raise money for the missions: films, magician show, fetes, concerts, hobbies' exhibition, etc. Talks by missionaries passing through.

6. Do not attempt too much in the beginning. Let the Society grow naturally.

The Mission Society is an excellent means of training Catholic Actionists. It caters for all, but its appeal is particularly strong with school children, because it relies very much on their natural hero-worship and love of adventure.

The Legion of Mary.

Discussing the problem of youth with a fellow priest, and inclined to be pessimistic, recalling the many activities which were so enthusiastically received at the beginning, and then gradually deserted, I asked him was there any society or organization which could hold a sufficient number of faithful adherents when the newness has worn off. His reply, and I value it all the more because he is so cool and cautious about introducing any new movement into his parish, was:

"The Legion of Mary has never yet failed, provided its rules are strictly obeyed. The Legion is built upon the personal prayers of its members. It is unlike all other organizations in that there are so many prayers at its meetings, and so many jobs to be done, and reported upon,

that those who have killed other organizations with their talk, have to stop talking to say the prescribed prayers, and are shy of talking unless they had done the job appointed to them. What generally happens is that the talkers leave in protest, or that the talkers are transformed into doers. Within the parish and within its schools establish a praesidium of the Legion of Mary, foster it with your presence and guidance, and you will not experience your former disappointments."

I cannot think of a finer tribute to the Legion of Mary as a unit of Catholic Action within the school. Knowing the priest, and his abhorrence of parish "stunts," I had no alternative but to follow his advice. The evidence of many parishes which have organized praesidia within the schools is so convincing that none of us should hesitate to introduce this organization of Catholic Action to the children in school.

Priests and their Schools.

The parish clergy enjoy a grand privilege, namely, the warm welcome of the children of the parish schools when the priest visits the class-rooms. The sea of smiles and happy eyes is enough to console the heart of any priest who might find his parish a difficult one. Even the youngest children readily recognise that the priest is the best teacher of religion. His words carry more conviction to them because they see him on the altar, in the pulpit, and hear him in the confessional. The Brother and Sister have many other subjects to teach them, but Father is a specialist on religion; that is his subject, and no one is able to explain it with such good effect as he. What Father says goes with the children.

I began the inspection of Christian Doctrine in the schools of the Archdiocese of Perth in 1922. These twenty years' experience are my authority for saying that the schools regularly visited by the parochial clergy to teach religion are the schools that delight a diocesan inspector's heart.

Within that weekly instruction, whose value is in strict proportion to the care of its preparation, the priest will sow the seeds of Catholic Action, dropping the seeds at moments when the soil of the children's hearts is made receptive by his talk, an indirect urging of the children to do something in payment for their many blessings of a Catholic education. Gradually the priest will lead the children to be on the look-out to offer their services, not to wait to be asked. The volunteered service is always the most acceptable. Through those indirect remarks, those

occasional hints, that opening of the door of opportunity to the children, and enkindling the flame of imagination to invest the ordinary activities of the parish with enthusiasm, the priest will educate the children to face unpleasant duties, and to shoulder distasteful tasks. The children can be trained to recognise that the more irksome the task the better the merit.

Two ideas that the priest can sow as seeds in his parish schools. The one applies the fact that our faith is founded on a Sacrifice. To assume willingly any duty that is inconvenient or disagreeable is to live one's faith more deeply by developing the spirit of sacrifice within oneself. Faith is the flame of life. If the flame is not fed it will flicker, and, perhaps, die. The oil that feeds the flame decides the brightness and the permanency of the light. As the oil burns low it must be replenished. And so with the flame of faith, it must be fed with the oil of personal sacrifice. That lesson should be taught in the nursery and continued through all stages of schooling.

The other lesson which the priest can teach is that children, even very young children, should be educated to do this or that service within the parish to show their appreciation for what their parents, their priests, and their teachers are doing for them. I think this lesson is neglected by us all. The child who polishes the candlesticks as an act of gratitude for his teachers is better prepared for life than the child who goes on taking everything without a moment's appreciation of and gratitude to his elders. Send the children then into the press-squads, into the Mission Society, into the Vincent de Paul groups, and into the many and varied activities of a School Praesidium of the Legion of Mary with the intention of repaying God by action for all that has come to them through their Catholic homes and schools.

The Problem of the Semi-Catholic Home.

The semi-Catholic home is the most urgent problem for the priest and teacher in this land. The children from these homes are coming to our schools in great numbers. We become discouraged when they do not come to Mass while they are still at school. For those children, with those homes and parents, coming to Mass is a sort of miracle when it happens. The miracle needed is still greater when they have left school, and the vast indifference of their new companions reinforces the carelessness of their own parents and homes. A mood of discouragement is not the attitude that wins victories. To the semi-Catholic homes we go as apostles, as invaders reclaiming lost territory. Every child

who comes to our schools from such homes is a net gain, an occasion to rejoice over. There are great possibilities of those children becoming better Catholics than their parents. If those children did not come to our schools we could do very little for them or their parents. Whenever a new church-school is opened in any of our city suburbs it is quickly filled. Attendance at Mass grows every year. That consoling fact must convince us that our schools are all the time winning gains from the semi-Catholic homes. The practical question is whether we can gain more, both during school days and after. Admittedly the first year or two after leaving school are the most critical. We suffer our major casualties then. For the moment we shall look to the future Youth Movement, along with the raising of the school age, to fill that gap. What more can we do while the children are still with us? In the Apostolate the conflict is more than the victory. The sceptical, the moral cowards, wish to be certain of victory before beginning the battle, and since no one can be so certain, therefore they shrug their shoulders and remain inert and inactive. It is well for us to recall that Christ praised the effort of the Apostles on casting their nets, and not upon their catch.

The hopeful course then is to look upon the semi-Catholic home as a vineyard worth cultivating. From the careless homes as they are we seek greater co-operation. We are teacher-apostles, teachers of the children in class, and apostles of the parents in their homes. The more we spend ourselves in cultivating the parents the richer results we shall have with the children.

J. T. McMAHON.

(To be Continued.)

The Beveridge Report and Plan

The Beveridge Plan may be good or bad; it may be adopted or shelved; but it is certainly a milestone in social history. It deals with only one phase of reconstruction; it was prepared under war-time difficulties; it is open to objection on many grounds. But its importance is not to be measured by its proposals alone. It has had a reception something like "The Origin of Species." That book deals with only one section of living things; it advances an extremely doubtful hypothesis. Yet it was the beginning of an epoch in many branches of science and human thought. The reasons for that disproportion are complex. First, it gathered together and presented to the public many ideas that were in the air. It came at a time when observation had accumulated many facts that had not been co-ordinated or the connections of which had occurred to few. It united these facts in a plausible formula easily grasped by the non-specialist. So with the Beveridge Report. It deals only with "social insurance and allied services." It applies to Great Britain only, but it emphasises assumptions which go far beyond the conclusions set down in the report, assumptions which bear on the whole of man's social, family and political life. Within its limits it is comprehensive. Though really complicated it wears a specious simplicity. It gathers under a simple system all sorts of apparently disconnected schemes and seeks to bring them to unity. What is more, it has been presented to a Government which has a reputation for courage, to which men look to build a new society on the foundations of the old.

The genesis of the plan is as follows. On February 6th, 1941, a deputation from the General Council of the Trade Union Congress met the Minister of Health and the Secretary of State for Scotland and drew their attention to a number of anomalies in the existing scheme of national insurance. The speakers dwelt on the complexity of the system; they pointed to gaps in it and concluded with the blunt assertion that "the whole thing is, in fact, bewildering" and that the country cannot afford "the expensive muddle and waste associated with it." As a sequel came the announcement on June 10th, 1941, that the Government was setting up an Inter-departmental Committee of which the terms of reference were "to undertake with special reference to the inter-relation of the schemes, a survey of the existing schemes of social

insurance and allied services including workmen's compensation, and to make recommendations." The Chairman was Sir William Beveridge, K.C.B., and he presided over a committee of eleven departmental representatives. Apparently the Chairman had his own ideas of what could be done under the terms. The members of the Committee soon found themselves in an anomalous position. They were Government mouthpieces. Yet they were to sign a report and make recommendations. The position was altered. They were given the status of advisers without responsibility for the report. The Committee became one man and the report is signed by Sir William Beveridge alone. During the enquiry help was given by many with whom he had been associated in his long years of social work. Many experienced or interested in the problem of social insurance were approached. One hundred and twenty-seven organisations or individuals gave written or oral evidence. It is a pity that the departmental experts did not send in a report. There are signs that Sir William Beveridge was set in his conclusions before all the evidence had been weighed. He may have been enamoured of his solution before the enquiry began. While he strives hard to maintain a judicial tone, at times he brushes aside, all too airily, a weight of serious opinions presented by those with a right to have their views carefully considered.

The results of the investigation appear in what is really a two-volume book. The first volume is rather awkwardly arranged. Sir William summarises his report. Then he analyses the chief changes which he proposes to introduce, adding remarks on special problems. He then sets out the finance of his scheme. Next comes the central feature, "Plan for Social Security." To this is annexed an interesting study of the assumptions on which the plan rests. Then follows a series of appendices, A - F, in which is a tabular analysis of various matters connected with the plan. It is rather amusing that Appendix B, 36 pages of small print, is all that is explicitly devoted to the "Survey of Existing Schemes," though, of course, these schemes come in for examination in other places. Yet this survey was the main business for which the Committee was appointed. We may suspect that the Government intended this survey, made by its own officers, to be the main feature of the report, and that they were not altogether pleased to find the limelight falling on a plan proposed by one not in government service, with all its details and its insistence on immediate action.

The second volume is Appendix G. Here are given in full or summary the memoranda of 43 of the 127 organisations that submitted views. War conditions made it impossible to print all the evidence—a real loss, since the documents provide a store of facts for social students. Though coloured by the interests of the parties, the memoranda show, with one exception, a calm and objective approach to the problem of doing away with want. Their spirit is tolerant and humane. They also show the ideas by which the Chairman was influenced or with which his life's work made him sympathetic. The final document, that from the National Federation of Associations of Old Age Pensioners, is a very touching document, taking us from the actuary's office to the homes and firesides of the aged poor.

It would not be easy to make a precis of the report and plan. We may abbreviate by omitting less important matters. We shall say nothing about the arrangements made to cover the transition period of 20 years during which the scheme will be moving to its completeness. We shall not go into details about the Marriage Grant to women, at most £10, nor about the Funeral Allowance, at most £20. We shall pass over the scale of benefits for workers below adult age. Looking at the main features of the scheme we see that its author keeps steadily in view his purpose of securing that at no period of life will any citizen be in want. The normal citizen, during his working years, supports himself and his family by his earnings. The report assumes that these earnings ought to place the family well above subsistence level. This doctrine has been stated elsewhere by Beveridge, and he assumes that there will be such a statutory wage. The problem is to secure freedom from want when the normal income from earnings is diminished or disappears. For this purpose a fund is to be built up from three sources, employers' contributions, contributions from insured persons, a grant from the Exchequer. Benefits to be distributed fall under such headings as Retirement Pensions, Unemployment Benefit, Disability Benefit, whether the disability occurs in the course of employment or not, Children's Allowances, National Health Service, Training during Unemployment. Each person is insured to receive a minimum subsistence allowance under all conditions. Calculating the requirements for subsistence on the basis of prices prevailing in 1938, and adding a rough estimate of 25 per cent. for subsequent rise in prices, the plan fixes the rate of subsistence during the period of adult work-

ing life at 24/- a week for a single man or woman, at 40/- for a man and wife where the wife is engaged solely in domestic duties. Retirement pensions are fixed at the same rate where men retire at 65 or women at 60. To encourage fit persons to continue work after these ages the scheme proposes an addition of 1/- a week for each extra year spent at work, or 2/- where the pension is the joint pension of man and wife. These figures are tentative and the plan assumes that circumstances may require changes in these grants and in the proportionate contributions.

During the working years of life earning may be interrupted by unemployment, sickness or accident. The scheme provides that during the period of unemployment the same subsistence rate as stated above shall be paid and, under the fundamental principle of the scheme, paid irrespective of any means the insured person may have. But a novel provision is that after he has drawn unconditional benefit for a limited period, normally after six months, the insured person, as a condition of receiving a benefit, will be required to attend a training centre for workers. The purpose of this is "to prevent deterioration" lest men may "settle down" to being unemployed, "to prevent habituation to idleness and as means of improving earning capacity." Where the unemployment is due to the failure of the accustomed type of work, e.g., where a widow has no longer the occupation of caring for a home, such training is intended to fit the unemployed person for a new type of occupation.

The second cause of interruption to earning is sickness or accident. Omitting special provision in industries to be scheduled as "hazardous," we may simplify the detailed proposals by saying that the plan arranges that all persons under contract of service will receive the subsistence allowance for 13 weeks of disability, whether due to illness or industrial accident. If still unable to resume work they are to receive two-thirds of their previous wages, subject to a minimum of the subsistence allowance, single or joint, and a maximum of £3 a week. There are certain adjustments for cases where disability leads to only partial loss of earning capacity.

One of the noteworthy recommendations in the Plan is that a National Health Service is to be established, to be financed in part from the Insurance Fund. Such a service would look to the "prevention and cure of disease and disability, rehabilitation and fitting for employment

by medical and post-medical treatment." That such a service be established is rather an assumption of the scheme than part of it. Sir William Beveridge writes of this assumption: "The case for regarding Assumption B as necessary for a satisfactory system of social security needs little emphasis. It is a logical corollary of the payment of high benefits in disability that determined efforts should be made by the State to reduce the number of cases for which benefit is needed. It is a logical corollary to the receipt of high benefits that the individual should recognise the duty to be well and to co-operate in all steps which may lead to diagnosis of disease in early stages when it can be prevented." Under the scheme medical treatment is to be made available for all in their own homes with specialist or consultant attendance where needed, provision being also made for the supply of dental, opthalmic and surgical appliances, for the help of nurses and midwives, for rehabilitation treatment after accidents.

The Plan is particularly interesting when it considers allowances for children. The matter comes up several times, so often that it is a pity reasons of economy have caused the omission of a subject index. The plan considers children as members both of the family and of the State. The matter under consideration perhaps causes special emphasis to be given to their relation to the State, but the rights and duties of parents are not overlooked. Beveridge's views may be gathered from remarks taken from different parts of the report. "Children's allowances should be regarded both as a help to parents in meeting their responsibilities, and as an acceptance of new responsibilities by the community." "When the responsible parent is earning there is no need to aim at allowances relieving the parent of the whole cost of the children. On the view taken here, it would be wrong to do so—an unnecessary and undesirable inroad on the responsibilities of parents." This sane view explains what may seem a strange provision of the scheme, namely, that where the responsible parent is not in receipt of pension or benefit no allowance is made for the first child born. The plan aims at easing the strain as the family increases. This is done normally by granting an allowance for each child after the first until the age of 16 is reached. The report considers that previous estimates of the needs of children have been ungenerous. It considers the normal expense of providing for a child to be 9/- a week. Accordingly, taking into account the provision already made through school meals and the supply of free or cheap milk, it fixes the allowance per child at 8/- a

week. This amount is to be paid for the first child also if the responsible parent is in receipt of benefit.

The position of women is fully examined in the plan. Housewives are regarded as a special and important part of the community. Normally home duties fully occupy them. Some may be gainfully employed outside the home. Such may continue to rank as single women for the purposes of benefit. But usually wives come under a joint insurance scheme with their husbands. For all women a maternity benefit is arranged which, the plan says, "is intended to make it easy and attractive for women to give up gainful occupation at the time of maternity, and will be at a rate materially higher than ordinary unemployment or disability benefit." The plan provides that for a period of 13 weeks there shall be a maternity benefit of 36/- a week in addition to a maternity grant of £4. It adds that while the maternity benefit should be liberal "it is not intended to cover the whole cost of maternity, which has a reasonable and natural claim on the husband's earnings." Single women are on the same basis as men for unemployment benefits. The position of children born out of wedlock and of their mothers is handled wisely and considerately. A widow receives special benefit of subsistence allowance for three months after her husband's death, and thereafter, if she has not reached retiring age, is classed for benefit and training with the unemployed.

To provide all these benefits the plan, when in full operation, will, in the estimate of the Government Actuary, require an expenditure of about £850 million. Not all of this is to come from the Social Insurance Fund. Health Services will largely be maintained by the State and local authorities. The whole of the Children's Allowances are made a charge on the State, this being done, the Report assures us, not as a matter of principle but for financial convenience. But when all deductions have been made the annual expenditure from the Insurance Fund will be about £550 millions. Towards this sum it is calculated that Insured Persons will contribute nearly £200 millions, employers and some minor sources of revenue nearly £150 millions. Accordingly the State, in addition to meeting heavy social charges for Children's Allowances and other benefits, will have to subsidise the fund to the extent of about £200 millions a year. The contributions of insured persons during adult working years are tentatively fixed as follows: For each male employee under contract of service 7/6 a

week will be paid, $4/3$ by the worker, $3/3$ by his employer. Female employees are to pay $3/6$ a week, the employer adding $2/6$. Men gainfully occupied but not employees pay $4/3$ a week, women $3/9$. Others who do no work for a living pay, men $3/9$ a week, women $3/-$. There is nothing arbitrary about these rates. They are accurately calculated in view of prospective benefits. The reasons for the variations will be found set out in the course of the report. The rates for persons between childhood and working years are on a lower scale.

Finally a new Department of State under a Cabinet Minister is to be set up and the whole administration, with few exceptions, passes under direct Government control. The extensive system of Friendly Societies, Industrial Insurance Companies, Approved Societies, Trade Union Insurance groups will be abolished. It is possible that, for a time, some Societies of the type may linger on, trying to do business in voluntary insurance. It is proposed to make some use of the Friendly Societies and Trade Unions as agents, at least at first, for the Ministry of Social Security. Or, it is suggested, they might concern themselves with National Assistance; that is, assistance under a means test for some who may slip through what is meant to be an all-embracing scheme. But little vitality would be left in such organisations. Their post as agents would, as one witness put it, "appear to be a bone with no meat upon it, to be thrown to Friendly Societies—as to a dog—in the hope that it may keep them quiet." If that is the idea it has certainly failed. Since the report appeared the Friendly Societies have been anything but quiet. They have been growling and barking in a most healthy fashion. And their membership runs to millions.

Such is a sketch of the main provisions of the Beveridge Plan. But it cannot be properly appreciated except by reading it in its complete form. No less worth reading is the Report that precedes it. This is full of interesting matter, of careful presentation and discussion of the problems that occurred during the survey, of ideas often provocative, that are the fruit of its author's unique experience in this field. The report has the advantage of being written in intelligible English, in contrast to the obscure language many economists use in discussing topics obscure in themselves. Moreover, in the course of the Report, there are many essays on particular topics which are gems of clearness and conciseness. The same praise is due to the most important of

the Appendices, that furnished by Sir George Epps, Actuary to the Government. Probably he had much to do with other sections of the first volume, but the financial pages are altogether his own. In his analysis of the finance of the plan he gives forty closely-reasoned pages, full of tables, figures, calculations, and yet his analysis is clear to all interested enough to follow him through his study of a complicated subject. It may be said that the whole report shows evidence of the help given by the best type of public servants, those who believe that their great duty is to serve the public.

What most captures the imagination is the boldness and comprehensiveness of the plan. It is revolutionary. The word is Sir William Beveridge's own. True he says: "It is a British revolution," one growing naturally out of existing institutions and built on past experience. A scheme intended to end want in every case and for all time, a scheme so constructive as to deal with every emergency of life, so destructive as to discard the whole system through which, voluntarily or by compulsion, social well-being had been promoted for generations, a scheme which aims at a liberal standard of life for all, deserves to be called revolutionary. Its author says bluntly that "before this war abolition of want was easily within the economic resources of the community; want was a needless scandal due to not taking the trouble to prevent it." He means that such a scandal shall never recur. The plan covers all citizens, independently of rank or income. It abolishes all Means Tests. Contributions are not fixed on a scale related to wages, salary, profession. With some exceptions, more apparent than real, it cuts away the tangle and complexity that has grown round social insurance. It declares social well-being to be a matter for immediate State control and that, not as a matter of expediency, but as a doctrine bound up with "the aims and logic of the plan." Finally it rejects delay and proposes that operations shall begin immediately after the war. We hope it is not the optimism of Sir William Beveridge that leads him to fix the initial date of operation as July 1st, 1944.

Another notable feature of the plan is that the document is not the chilling document of a mechanical calculator. It does not envisage society as something distinct from human beings. The plan is meant to fit the character of the people to whom it is to be applied. For this reason it rejects the proposal to put all the financial burden on the State. It prefers an illogical system, called "outmoded," in the evidence of the Fabian Society. It is based on the principle that benefits

are not a dole. Sir William writes: "Benefit in return for contributions, rather than free allowances from the State, is what the people of Britain desire." Again, speaking of the popular objection to any kind of Means Test, he says: "This objection springs not so much from a desire to get everything for nothing as from resentment of a provision which appears to penalise what people have come to regard as the duty and pleasure of thrift, of putting pennies away for a rainy day. Management of one's income is an essential element of a citizen's freedom. Payment of a substantial part of the cost of benefit as a contribution irrespective of the means of the contributor is the firm basis of a claim to benefit irrespective of means." And again: "The citizen by paying, not, indeed, the whole cost, but a substantial part of it as a contribution, can feel that he is getting security not as a charity but as a right." It is noteworthy that the General Council of the Trades Union Congress in its evidence states that "the question of paying has, of course, to be faced, but we feel sure that neither the insured person nor anybody else will object to paying, provided they know their money is not being wasted." Similar ideas are expressed throughout the evidence given before the Committee and were a source of the confidence with which so bold a plan was put before the nation.

Having set out the main features of the scheme and some points that call for commendation, we turn to examine it in the light of Catholic teaching. One sad fact emerges. As far as the plan and printed evidence go, all Catholic study of the subject has been wasted. When we think of the series of papal pronouncements, the mass of Catholic writing in exposition of Catholic principles, the schemes of Catholic experts for applying these principles, all our books, lectures, pamphlets, articles, it is something of a shock to find from the Beveridge Report that we seem to have made no contact with the economic movement of our time. Where something in this Report marches with Catholic ideas this springs not from acquaintance with our teaching but from expediency or from some half-forgotten tradition of human decency that has survived from a finer past. Only in one memorandum and that, strangely enough, the evidence of the Royal Burgh of Aberdeen, is there any recognition that there once existed a non-material tradition of social order, that the poor ever had a status other than that to which they were degraded by the Poor Laws of England. The Aberdeen evidence begins with the statement: "In pre-Reformation

days the poor were sustained principally by the Church, an institution which, in early times, exercised many of the functions which the State exercises to-day. After the Reformation, the new Church was not able to relieve the poor to the same extent as the old Church had done for centuries, and, as a result, begging became universal." Except for some Catholic signatories to the memoranda from Friendly Societies, that is the only hint that there was or is a Church. Perhaps our Catholic propaganda is making an impression. But the signs are not here.

Next we remark that, despite the high estimate of British national determination and courage which Sir William Beveridge has properly formed, there is ground for alarm in his apparent acceptance of racial decay. He dwells on the happiness ahead, but he seems to be preparing only a sunset glory for the close of the British day. The scheme is, in part, a scheme of pensions for aged people; as a whole it is a scheme of pensions for an aged race. It proceeds on the explicit assumption that the birth-rate will not increase, that in 1971 the old-age pensioners will exceed the number of those receiving children's allowances, that there will be a disproportionate number of elderly folk, and that the disproportion will be the more marked because social insurance will safeguard health and increase the length of life. The only suggestion for correcting the balance is "to give first place in social expenditure to the care of childhood and to the safeguarding of maternity." The financial burden that will be thrown on the younger section of the community is to be eased by cash inducements to old people to continue at work beyond the age at which retirement is allowed. The problem of the birth-rate lies outside the subject of the report, but there are incidental remarks that sound no note of hope. The Report tells us that "with the present rate of reproduction the British race cannot continue; means of reversing the recent course of the birth-rate must be found. It is not likely that allowances for children or any other economic incentives will, by themselves, provide that means and lead parents who do not desire children to rear children for gain. But children's allowances can help to restore the birth-rate, both by making it possible for parents who desire more children to bring them into the world without damaging the chances of those already born, and as a signal of the national interest in children, setting the tone of public opinion. As regards care of children, whatever possibilities the future may have of larger families than now, the small families of to-day make it necessary

that every living child should receive the best care that can be given to it." It is strange that, holding such views, the writer does not see the wisdom of helping those who would be glad to marry and rear a family, if only they could afford to set up house. The Marriage Grant would not buy the bride's travelling dress. A Marriage Loan to start a young couple in life seems never to have been considered. Did no Catholic organisation offer evidence?

The next criticism to be made is that, in spite of the great labour spent on the report, it has been too hastily prepared. The result is that essential matters have been left unsettled. As the plan stands it would not work. Frequently those whose co-operation would have been most valuable stated that owing to shortage of staffs and the pressure of war work they were unable to submit considered replies to questions on matters about which they would normally have given expert advice. Thus the County Councils Association reported that, though it tried to collect information, its principal officers were too busy with war duties to prepare adequate replies. So they preface their answers with the words: "The Association deem it their duty to enter an emphatic protest against the hasty manner in which this matter is being proceeded with." Sir William Beveridge admits "the difficulty in planning reconstruction of the social services during the height of war." He did not overcome the difficulty. He seems to have been so eager to produce a plan that he left gaps in it bigger than those he was asked to remove. There is too much of such phrases as "requiring fuller examination" and "a matter for regulation." Two matters left hanging in the air are so fundamental that we can well understand why, in spite of taunts, the Government would not be rushed into immediate action on the plan. In any scheme of reconstruction the position of Agriculture as an industry is of first importance. Present conditions and future prospects in England demand that the rural worker shall have his position settled. We in Australia looked specially to see how the plan dealt with rural life. Under the existing system the English rural worker is put on a different basis from the factory employee. The liability of the rural employer is limited. Low wages make it impracticable to fix the contribution from the rural worker on the urban scale. There is little unemployment in the countryside, and it is thought unreasonable to ask the rural worker to pool risks with workers subject to frequent periods of idleness. The Report reflects its writer's uneasiness on this matter. He is committed to the principle of a flat rate of

benefit for a universal and compulsory flat rate of contribution as the only true principle of social insurance. The aesthetic simplicity of his scheme appeals to him. Anything that mars its simplicity, such as differential treatment of special industries, offends against it. He dwells with force on the importance of bringing the rural worker into line with the urban worker. He tries to make light of the practical difficulties, but in the end postpones the question as it "should be the subject of a special enquiry in preparing the detailed insurance scheme." A plan which leaves undecided the whole position of primary industry can scarcely claim completeness.

Another glaring defect in the plan is its failure to reach a conclusion on the question of house rent for the unemployed. Large families require large houses. Large houses mean large rents. Rents vary greatly in different areas. The expenditure on rent cannot well be reduced during the period of unemployment. Is it equitable that relief payments should be uniform where rents far from uniform have to be paid? The report exposes the problem admirably. The average of rent paid by "standard households" varies from 16/- a week in London to 7.6/- in Scotland and 4.7/- in rural areas. Various bodies in their memoranda dwelt on this problem and urged that actual rent and not an assumed "average rent" should be taken into account in paying benefits. The report puts the case fairly for such variation, but the idea of variation is hateful to Sir William. He says: "The suggestion raises questions of principle and practice." "The proposal to vary the benefit . . . cannot be dismissed as impracticable or as clearly wrong in principle. Nevertheless, the balance of argument in the end appears to be against the proposal." The final decision arrived at seems to rest on a sanguine optimism that "as a result of a determined and successful effort to deal with urban congestion . . . inequalities of rent will disappear." But "any regional differentiation of benefits and contributions would detract from the simplicity of the social insurance scheme." But Sir William remains uneasy. He suggests "further examination," that "the question might be conveniently referred to a (proposed) committee," that the matter might be left in the air as one that "depends on a solution of other social problems." Here is a scheme pretending to completeness in which it is left uncertain what contributions rural workers are to pay, what benefits anyone at all is to get, and yet it is to operate from July 1st, 1944. The comprehensiveness of the scheme is illusory. To proceed to adopt it would lead

to confusion and muddle added to the muddle it is proposed to terminate.

The financial side of the scheme does not particularly concern us. An unfortunate remark at the end of the report has led to misunderstanding. It is said: "Want could have been abolished before the present war by a redistribution of income within the wage-earning classes, without touching the wealthier classes." This has led some to suppose that the plan is meant to leave the wealthier classes alone and make the better-paid workers come to the aid of the less fortunate. The remark was merely meant to show that, before the war, industry was quite able to meet the problem of want because it was actually paying enough to put all above want. Actually the purely theoretical character of the remark is shown by the words immediately following: "This is not to suggest that the redistribution of income should be confined to the wage-earning classes . . . It is simply said as the most convincing demonstration that abolition of want was easily within the resources of the community." Very little examination is needed to show that the report contemplates a general shifting of the balance of wealth. The Insurance Fund will be built up by contributions of 22 per cent. from insured persons, 15 per cent. from employers, 2 per cent. from interest on funds in hand, 61 per cent. by contribution from the exchequer. One point overlooked in the discussion, even, I fancy, by Sir William Beveridge himself, is that the 22 per cent. to be paid by insured persons comes from the pockets of many others besides employees. It is the payment of *all* insured persons. These are the whole body of citizens, not merely employees. I cannot find from the figures of the Government Actuary what part of the 22 per cent. comes from non-employees, but the amount generally assigned as coming from employees is much less than appears. Be it noted that, in addition to his personal contribution the employer also pays 3/3 of the total contributed for each employee. Furthermore, over three-fifths of the fund comes out of taxes. These taxes will be heavy and, though indirect taxation falls on the whole community, it is certain that the greatest part of the sum will, as is proper, come from those best able to pay. It seems certain that the scheme tends towards a real redistribution of income, though, alas! not of property.

Another point of finance that seems to have been overlooked is that no charge is set against the Insurance Fund to supply compensation promised by Sir William. The Trades Union Congress drew attention to the necessity of protecting the interests of the employees

of the doomed Approved Societies and Insurance Companies. This will not be difficult as it is proposed to take over such employees in order to have the benefit of their experience when the scheme is launched. But Sir William Beveridge distinctly asserts that compensation will be paid to shareholders in Industrial Insurance Offices. At the end of the plan the problem of such compensation is raised—and left unsolved. A certain petulance is shown in the brief discussion. "The State," we read, "cannot undertake to compensate individuals in every case for damage which they may suffer as a result of developments of State policy. To do so would involve compensating all those who were damaged by, say, a change of tariffs or in regard to the use of land for different types of building." We need examine neither Sir William's principle nor his logic. All we wish to say is that, having promised compensation he has made no provision for paying it. In equity the compensation should be paid from the fund which receives the moneys formerly paid to the displaced organisations. This seems to have been overlooked.

But we meet more fundamental difficulties when we consider the spirit of the plan. Bluntly, it is a long step towards the Servile State. On the surface it might appear to be merely a convenient if drastic measure whereby the State, for purposes of simplification, takes over existing systems and brings unity out of complexity. But the systems replaced by a Department of State happen to cover the whole life of a great people from the cradle to the coffin. Catholics are familiar with the passage of "*Quadragesimo Anno*," where the Pope deplores the disappearance of the associations that once stood between the individual and the State. He regrets that in our time the State has become encumbered with duties once borne by associations dispossessed by the State which now finds itself overwhelmed by an infinity of affairs and duties. It was in the field of assisting the sick and unemployed that those associations did a great social work. Friendly Societies had in our time some of the features of those old Industrial Guilds. But now these Societies are, in turn, doomed. The social well-being of the individual is to become the immediate care of the State, and his relation to it will be one we find repugnant when we read of it as the lot of a German or Russian citizen. This is not rhetoric. Hints of what is intended are given in the Beveridge Report and Plan. Much of the working of the scheme is left behind the veil of "regulations to be framed," that delight of the bureaucratic mind, that secret weapon of

regimentation. We may evolve the hints that are given. Much of the Plan is concerned with the most helpless portion of the community, the sick, the unemployed, the widow. The unemployed are to be aided, but under what conditions? They are to be required to submit to training after a certain period, and benefit is "subject to satisfactory attendance at a training centre." This sounds excellent until we find annexed to it a guarantee of "removal and lodging grants." And in another place where the subject of training benefit is discussed we read: "Conditions imposed on benefit must be enforced where necessary by suitable penalties." And the whole question is introduced by the ominous words, "Subject to regulations." What is meant is that the State has the right, under penalty, to order an unemployed person to leave or move his home and go to a place to be fixed by regulation, to take up a trade to be fixed for him by regulation, to accept such work and in such a place as shall be directed by regulation. It is specially provided that widows under 60 come under these provisions. Such powers are too wide to be placed in the hands of State officials. They will surely not be granted. Again we notice a strange silence about unemployment caused by strikes. The plan never hints that general unemployment is due to any cause except depression in trade. Does it intend to leave in the hands of bureaucracy the power to make a strike impossible? The Insurance funds that were formerly in the hands of the Trade Unions will now be in the hands of the State. It will have under it the control of the means of subsistence. In practice that means that only the State could allow workers to strike. The right to strike cannot be justly taken from workers. It is a right subject to abuse, but, in Catholic teaching, the right may, under certain conditions, be properly exercised by workers. The weapon of starvation should not be left in the hands of the State to exercise by regulation. On the very page where the plan goes out of its way to dwell on the advantages of powers conferred by regulation, we read: "In the last resort the man who fails to comply with the conditions for obtaining benefit or assistance and leaves his family without resources must be subject to penal treatment." Before the plan is proceeded with it is necessary to see what may lie, unsuspected by the author, behind the fair facade.

But are we right in saying "unsuspected by the author?" Consider what it is proposed to impose on the community under the guise of a National Health Service. The Report properly states that where generous benefits are provided there should be a scheme for seeing that

sickness and disability are reduced as far as possible. But what this panacea of a plan involves is brought home to us when the phrase slips in that it will be made compulsory to visit the dentist "to be inspected periodically." These words, with their calm vision of a regimented State, make us look more closely at the details of the scheme. We read that "the questions for answer in this (part of the) Report are, in the main, financial." We disagree. Far more important is it to answer the question, how far will the freedom of the individual be tampered with? One word gives us another hint. The service is stated to have as its first object the "prevention" of disease. This, we take it, will be secured by regular "periodical inspection." The arrangements will, of course, not be known until they are made "by regulation." But it is clear that there will be compulsory and periodic inspection under penalty, domiciliary visits by doctors, health officers and the whole posse of experts, from chiropodists to psycho-analysts, that fasten on to such a scheme. Now this inspection is an excellent thing in itself. It is good that, like the marshalled ranks of soldiers, we should know our blood classification, that a comforting X-ray should tell us we have no T.B., that all our teeth should be removed in adolescence lest they become foci of infection, that our antrums should be ventilated. But we have to balance the saving of money to the Insurance Fund against the loss of individual and domestic freedom. Citizens may wisely be educated to have every organ they possess immunised by injections or put to rest for ever by excisions. But very many citizens have a profound loathing for such regimentation. Sir William would rightly consider them below the Balliol standard as logicians and suitable penalties would be provided by regulation. We do not wish to enter into the nice discussion as to the relative comfort of a dentist's chair and a convict's cell. We only wish to bring out the hidden beauties of these proposals. And, after all, if anyone doesn't like the new order he can always apply for the Funeral Grant.

Moreover, under this scheme, it is clear that the medical profession will develop into a section of the Public Service. The report points out that there will be room for private practice. In other words it is not intended to make it a crime to pay the State for the services of a doctor and then go to another at our own expense. But how many doctors will there be to choose from and how are they to combine their compulsory public service with the care of their private practice? Memoranda submitted in evidence, especially from women's organisations, express dissatisfaction with the existing system of trying to com-

bine private and panel practice. Equally they object to what they see is inevitable under the scheme, the compulsory filching from the poorer and middle classes of the right to choose their own doctor. One looked with interest to see what the Plan would have to say on this point. The answer is the all too familiar one: "Most of the problems of organisation . . . fall outside the scope of the Report. It is not necessary to express an opinion on such questions as the free choice of doctor, group or individual practice." For Catholics this is a question on which it is necessary to express an opinion. Medicine and morality meet at many places, and the practices condoned or recommended by some so-called heads of the medical profession in England are, according to divine law, mortal sins.

Again, who can view with complacency the control of so much of the life of the community by Government officials? Merely from the business point of view it is essential for the officers of the Friendly Societies and Insurance Companies to give courtesy, sympathy, understanding. Accordingly, it is their practice to keep their officers in the same district for a long time so that they become familiar with the character and feeling of the locality and, as evidence shows, come to be regarded as friends and advisers by their clients. The Government official will not have the duty of holding business against a rival. He is, as a rule, in no way lacking in the gift of sympathy, but he has a different background. The less civil type of civil servant will have a clear field for the unpleasant exercise of his authority; the ordinary type will be trammelled by regulations and restrictions, imposed by the age-old tradition of "referring the matter for consideration." The topic recurs repeatedly in evidence. Space allows us only to refer to the account of the social work of the agents of Approved Societies (Appendix G, p. 53), and to contrast it with the experience of those pensioners who have to deal with the Department known as the Assistance Board. The old people say: "If the investigators were unfettered by sets of rules and regulations, facts would be brought to light of torment, worry, depression and unhappiness which, knowing the officers of the Board as we do, we are convinced the majority of them would seek to overcome and eradicate. . . . In this direction the Board has failed, not the fault of its officers, who have done all they could, but rather it is the Board's general policy whose aim it appears to be to pass the responsibility to someone else. . ." We leave the matter there.

In another direction Sir William seems to have erred in his judgment of the psychological effect of his scheme. We have said that he

regards economics as a human science and not as a set of graphs and curves. The reason he chose a contributory scheme was that it would appeal to the human desire to receive benefit as a right, not as a dole. But when he came to the details he seems to have forgotten this idea. Under the scheme the worker will never be conscious that he is contributing anything. He will never handle the money designated as his contribution. 7/6 a week will be the combined payment of worker and employer. But what will happen is in the words of the report: "The insurance stamp will be affixed to the employment book by the employer and will represent the joint contribution of employer and employee, the employee's share being deducted from his wages or salary." In fact, therefore, the worker will have a nominal wage and a real wage. Part of his nominal wage he will never touch. In practice the employer pays the whole amount. The employee will insist that the real wage he receives be a fair one, and the 4/3 paid on his behalf by the employer will never trouble his mind. The idea of thrift, the pleasure of managing one's own income of which the Report speaks will not be a product of this scheme. On the contrary. We know what goes on in our own country under a Wages Tax. Wages are raised so as to include what the employee is supposed to pay, and, ultimately, the whole tax falls on the employer. In reality, this does not greatly matter. The Insurance Fund must, in one way or the other, be a tax on industry. But the arguments of the condemned Societies that they have built up habits of thrift amongst the people and that these habits are now endangered is not answered at any stage.

Our final and main objection to the plan is that it blocks the way to a sound reconstruction of Society. The Beveridge Plan is only a part of the new order adumbrated for British social life. The plan is often left hazy at an important stage, just because the author cannot foresee the type of society into which it has to be fitted. Sometimes Sir William seems to chafe at this limitation on his efforts; sometimes he seems glad that he can project into the obscurity of a doubtful time problems that it would be awkward for him to solve now. He tells us that this is the acceptable time for a social revolution. "A revolutionary moment in the world's history is a time for revolution, not for patching." But the weakness of his scheme is precisely that it is a patch, and a patch prepared without knowing to what material it is to be affixed. It is a patch because it is a proposal for a redistribution of money, not of property. It assumes that the old sharp division between Haves and Havenots will be maintained. Sir William has a

true feeling for the relation of material well-being to proper human dignity. A real insurance scheme should have been drawn by him resting not on the subsistence idea of wages but on the idea of wages and labour as a means to ownership. But his horizon is narrow. We notice this especially in his valuable study of the relation between rent and wages. A more important question does not seem to have occurred to him, the problem of the man who is paying, not rent, but a regular sum as a sinking fund towards the buying of his house. Such a man pays an amount much above the rental value of the house. No help is proposed for him, but it should be secured in an insurance scheme that such a man has not to let his payments lapse during non-earning periods. This shortsightedness mars the writer's whole view of what the new order ought to be. He regards thrift as a social virtue though, as we have said, he rather discourages it. But thrift is not a good thing in itself. It is good chiefly as a means to independence and ownership. Wards of the State—and that is to be the future status of Englishmen—are freed from the need of taking thought for the morrow. It is greatly to be feared that not only will the ordinary worker not practise thrift with a view to ownership, but that he will lose his sense of wanting to be his own master and own his home. Instincts may be atrophied, and so may human ideals.

In another way the plan gives a setback to any move in favour of the Catholic programme of establishing organic society. The Catholic idea is that democracy should be so extended that self-government be established in each of the main industries. Part of the work of the Industrial Councils in each industry would be to safeguard the workers from the chances of life. It is interesting to note that in more than one place the plan proposes to set up statutory associations, "bilateral, combining the management and the labour in each industry." But such associations are to be given only the duty of distributing a special levy to be made on employers in "hazardous" industries. Then follow notable words: "The distribution of the levy, however, though one of the necessary functions of a statutory association, is not its only or its main one. The main purpose of the proposal made here, is, within the framework of general social security, to utilise the knowledge, the initiative and the interest of those concerned in the industry." Why a system for dealing with a particularly difficult matter should not have been developed in other directions in the plan is hard to discover. It would be a real step to conciliation in industry of which, at other times, Sir William Beveridge has been an apostle. Surely such associations could be multiplied and their duties extended! But the fair goddess,

Uniformity, beckons. Actually the plan sets out to destroy similar associations already existing. There are in operation two schemes in special industries, banking and insurance, which, the report states, "are undoubtedly administered with efficiency and satisfaction to the persons covered by them." We are told how sad a thing it is to lose the interest and goodwill that these schemes represent, but "retention of this historical privilege by these two special industries can no longer be justified. . . . Unemployment insurance by industry is a line of development on which progress has ended." Sir William's own studies must have told him that it ended in the sixteenth century because a royal thief stole the Insurance Fund. But there was not, and there is not, any reason why insurance through industry should not revive in a new social order. Sir William himself writes: "Any plan for Social Security in the narrow sense assumes a concrete social policy in many fields." His own plan, he says, "is put forward as a limited contribution to a wider social policy." No one in our time has worked harder at the task of planning, not theoretically but realistically, a more ordered and happy world. He has returned to that wider task since his report was submitted. We regret—and it is our main objection to his plan—that he seems unaware of a design for a new world resting on Christian principles, principles which were swept down in the flood that took from his countrymen their liberties as well as their religion.

A Catholic is in something of a difficulty in trying to give a verdict on the Beveridge Plan. It is the greatest single effort in our time to prepare a better world on democratic foundations. It is full of suggestions, some of them novel, that everyone must support. It is the work of a realist. But there is much in it that makes one recoil. If the proposals were carried out exactly as they stand freedom from want might be secured, only by putting individual freedom in perpetual pawn. But the discussions that have arisen around the report show that those who are to benefit by it are alive to its defects. One point in English psychology Sir William overlooked. He drew up a logical plan. But it was drawn up, we are glad to say, for an illogical people. There is reason to believe that the plan will not be implemented without qualifications insisted on by the sound feeling of the people. Englishmen do not talk much about freedom. But they have it and will keep it. With the prospect of such modifications and awaiting the guidance of Catholic authority we may welcome the plan with dislike. We should insist on holding to the good that is in it, and our dislike may be confined to those features which conflict with Catholic principle and which will, to some extent, be removed.

The reception given to the report carries a lesson for Catholic social students in Australia. How is it that men like Beveridge, Cole and Laski catch the public attention? They are, of course, men of high ability and education, men very much in earnest, sincere, even devoted, in their striving after human improvement. But the chief reason why they make the public heed what they say is that their ideas are applied in detail to conditions around them. As the report we have been examining states: "The principles underlying any practical reform can be judged only by seeing how they could work in practice." At an early stage of the modern revival of Catholic social study it was realised that repeated enunciation of the principles laid down in the encyclicals would not go far on the way to establishing a Christian order. We had to see how far these principles could and should be applied to local conditions. In Australia we have made this advance. But we need to go further. We must be more detailed if we are to interest the public. We had to go into details hastily when our own scheme of National Insurance was mooted. Those engaged on the Catholic Rural movement are now going into details. But on certain topics such as Housing, Industrial Councils, Decentralisation, we have not gone far enough. What is needed is that we should have concrete proposals, which, like the Beveridge Plan, need only the work of a Parliamentary draughtsman to turn them into Bills ready for Canberra. And as legislation on social problems is sure to be a Federal matter, it is important that our local efforts should be unified and should develop from the stage of State enquiry into a combined Australia-wide movement of Catholic Social Study. The study must become practical as soon as possible. We should have proposals ready for the Reconstruction Committee, so advanced that the ordinary citizen feels that they touch himself. We should not merely advance principles on Housing, but should bluntly state: This land in this district should be resumed. Such a price should be paid for it. Houses of the attached design should be built. The rent and sinking fund should be so much a week. People will object to our proposals. Until they do our proposals are not live proposals. The lesson of the Beveridge Plan is that a man who knows his subject, who has his mind made up as to what exactly he wants and is in earnest about it, can stir the imagination of a people. He can even galvanise a Government. If we hope to get action on Christian Principles the Sermon on the Mount must be brought down into the plains and the streets. We don't want merely a design for life. We want the blueprints as well.

WILLIAM KEANE, S.J.

In Diebus Illis

IV.

YOUNG MICHAEL McGRATH.

Michael McGrath and Richard Walsh were divinity students at the Seminary at Waterford when they heard Dr. Ullathorne's call for priests to labour in the neglected field of the Australian Mission. They volunteered and left Ireland before their course was finished, arriving in Sydney shortly after Father Charles Lovat, preceding, it would seem, the band of priests who came in 1838. The two lads went into St. Mary's Seminary to complete their studies under Father Lovat, at the same time lending a hand in the teaching of the junior classes. They were ordained probably before the end of the year 1838 or the beginning of 1839 (the dates given in various newspaper references are at variance), perhaps a little before due time as the shortage of priests even with Dr. Ullathorne's recruits was acute. Father Geoghegan was in need of assistance in the growing Port Phillip district, and Richard Walsh—sedate, safe, urbane and full of the promise which was later on abundantly fulfilled—was sent to help him, while Michael McGrath—tireless, fearless, impetuous, sometimes floored but never beaten—did duty round Sydney, sometimes at Parramatta. They were only twenty-three and the world had on its Sunday clothes, and experience was before them. At the beginning of 1840 McGrath was sent along to lighten the burden borne by Father Lovat in the extensive Yass-Goulburn district which embraced all the southern part of New South Wales. After a little while under his old president he was given charge of the Goulburn end where he began his ministry towards the end of February, 1840.

Goulburn was then, relatively speaking, an old and settled place. It had been at least seen as early as 1800 by an expedition sent out by Governor Hunter, as was mentioned in a previous article. Some fourteen years later the district was explored by Hamilton Hume, Throsby and Meehan. Oxley's name is also in the story. Hume wrote in "The Monitor":—

"In the year 1814, accompanied by my two brothers, I discovered that tract of country now called Argyle. I was also there in the years 1816 and 1817. In the year 1818 I again accompanied Throsby and the late Mr. Meehan. Mr. Meehan discovered the beautiful lake now called Lake Bathurst, and Goulburn Downs."

Meehan bestowed the name in compliment to Henry Goulburn, the Secretary of State for War and the Colonies, and this was ratified by Macquarie in 1820. An earlier name had been Strathallan, and later Alexander McLeay tried to induce the Surveyor-General, Major Mitchell, to change it to Lorne, as the name Goulburn was becoming overworked. Dr. Lang wrote:—

• “I hate you Goulburn Downs and Goulburn Plains
And Goulburn River, the Goulburn Range,
And Mount .. Goulburn and Goulburn Plains. One’s brains
Are turned with Goulburns! Pitiful this mänge
For immortality! Had I the reins
Of Government for a fortnight, I would change
These common place appelatives, and give
The country names that should deserve to live.”¹

Mitchell was all in favour of keeping the native terms except when he yielded to his own personal whim of substituting the names of battlefields of The Peninsular War where he had served, but because of Macquarie’s part in the matter he retained “Goulburn.” Meehan is the Jimmy Main who, according to Father McEncroe (forty years after the explorer’s death) was responsible for putting St. Mary’s in what was then the backblocks of Sydney—to save the Governor the suffering of beholding the poor Catholics while on his way to Church at the fashionable St. Phillip’s. Meehan was a political prisoner of the ’98 rebellion—sent out with Father Dixon—and although he stood well with Macquarie was not the type to sell his birthright. It has been suggested that his insistence in getting St. Mary’s put where it is was a long-headed trick for which later generations have blessed his name.²

By 1840 there had gathered in the Goulburn district some loyal and influential Catholics whose names should be recorded. At Lake George were the Kennys and the Careys, at whose homes Father Therry had frequently said Mass. At Bungonia were the Lynchs and the McLennans, where Father John Fitzpatrick also had celebrated the Divine Mysteries. Then in the neighbourhood were the Armstrongs and the McAlisters whose descendants are still of the Faithful in the district. The McAlisters were kinsmen of Captain Lachlan McAlister, one of the earliest settlers, and the explorer of a great part of Gippsland. Charles McAlister, who came from Scotland as a child of three

¹Wyatt Hist. of Goulburn.

²Cleary, Australia’s Debt, etc.

years in 1833, wrote the book "Old Pioneering Days in the Sunny South," which has often been drawn upon for these pages, and which is regarded as the most reliable source of information we have on the early days of Goulburn and the County Argyle. Two of his neices have given long and useful service to the Old Church in the Convent of The Sisters of St. Joseph at North Goulburn. Out Queanbeyan way there was Balcombe, a son of that William Balcombe at whose home, "The Briars," at St. Helena, Napoleon Bonaparte was accommodated till Hudson Lowe had Longwood and its miseries ready to harass the fallen Emperor. William Balcombe was suspected by Lowe of conveying letters from Napoleon to Europe and of negotiating bills, for which he suffered many disabilities; as a compensation for these unfounded charges he was appointed Colonial Treasurer in New South Wales in 1823. He was further given a grant of land which he took up in the Goulburn district and called it "The Briars," after his St. Helena home. Here he introduced into Australia the first sweet briar, for which succeeding generations have not thanked him. A better importation by the same man was the slips of willow from Napoleon's grave from which, so 'tis said, practically all the willows in Australia have sprung.

Of more interest to this narrative are the Wicklow Dwyers, who were prominent in the locality for many years. John Dwyer, son of the exiled chieftain, settled at Bungendore in 1838 and lived there for forty-four years. John O'Sullivan, whose name appears so frequently in the biographies of Father Therry and Dr. Polding, married Bridget, daughter of Michael Dwyer, and managed the Commercial Bank in Goulburn for thirty years. The story of the stand made by "brave Michael Dwyer" belongs to the stormy history of '98, but his career from his capitulation after the arrest of Robert Emmet in 1803 belongs to us as well. He dictated the terms of his surrender, which were accepted but not honoured. He stipulated America as the place of his voluntary exile, but he was brought to Australia in the anomalous role of a quasi voluntary convict. The truculent Bligh picked a quarrel and had him sent to Norfolk Island, but Paterson, who took charge on the deposition of Bligh, gave him a grant of one hundred acres of land near Liverpool, which Macquarie ratified, subsequently making him Chief Constable of the district.

With him to share his exile in Australia, as she had boldly shared his outlawry in the Wicklow Hills, came "Mary of the Mountains"—

"Dwyer's Mary"—Mary Doyle that was. Round many an Irish turf fire they used to tell the story, and perhaps they tell it still, how a band of forty horsemen, with a green cockade on the hat and the cross of St. Patrick on the breast, followed their leader, with the price upon his head, down the hills to take Mary Doyle away with her father's blessing to be married by Father John Murphy, and so weave her name among the great romances of the world, and write it in her country's history as one of those peerless Irish women who were, in the words which Father Maurice O'Reilly puts into the mouth of "A Veteran of the Guard"—

"The best and thurst help-mates the good God ever gave
To nurse the hayro sperrit in a man."

She was a golden haired lass of only seventeen when she threw in her lot with Michael Dwyer. She remained with him in the mountains through the days of terror; she inspired him in his brave but hopeless stand in his Country's cause; and when all lost it was she advised surrender. When she came to Sydney in 1805 she brought the youngest children with her, leaving the oldest two at home; others were born here, making a family of seven altogether. In 1828, when her husband was dead, John and Peter came out to join her, accompanied by John O'Sullivan. Ten years later John Dwyer took a property near Bungendore where he lived till 1882, having reached the patriarchal age of eighty-one. 'Twas his residence there which helped to make the Lake George district a Catholic centre so early in our history.

After his arrival in 1828 John O'Sullivan lived and studied for seven or eight years with Father Therry in Sydney. In or about 1838, when he settled in Goulburn he married Bridget, and at their home, and at Bungendore, and sometimes at Forest Lodge, Mary of the Mountains spent her days. A devout woman and always a patriotic one, her interests were her God and her Country, and though, like poor Fanny Parnell, her eyes did not behold the coming of the glory of the latter, from Heaven came abundant consolation—a grandson, Father John Dwyer, O.S.B., a priest, two granddaughters, nuns at Subiaco, two more at St. Vincent's. In the influenza epidemic of 1861 she passed away a very old woman. She was buried in the Devonshire Street Cemetery beside her Wicklow hero where, in 1878, Father John erected a vault to receive those of the clan already gone and to await those who were to follow. When in 1898 they removed the ashes

from the vault to the splendid monument at Waverley, amid one of the greatest scenes of enthusiasm witnessed in Sydney, the body of Mary of the Mountains was found to be as they left it thirty-seven years before. The features had not changed and the silken hair was peeping from beneath the white frill of the little cap just as though she had been laid to her rest but yesterday.

It was Father John Dwyer, the grandson, who figured with Father Jerome Keating in the disconcerting of Henry Parkes, then Colonial Secretary, during the hysteria which abounded after the shooting of the Duke of Edinburgh at Clontarf in 1868. O'Farrell was a lawyer by profession but a failure because of drunken habits, and there is no doubt that he was a madman and not the only member of his family so afflicted. A brother tried to shoot Dr. Goold, the Bishop of Melbourne. After the unfortunate happening at Clontarf one of those extraordinary eruptions of anti-Catholic feeling which is always smouldering in the bigoted mind broke out in Sydney. Every Catholic was suspected of being a party to some dreadful plot to overthrow the whole British Constitution. Parkes saw Pöpes in his sleep, and the peace of the whole community was rattled to the foundation. The wily Colonial Secretary tried by a trick to get from the condemned man an admission that Fenianism was rife in Australia. Entering the cell as though he had come to condole, he had a reporter hidden outside to take down the damning information; but the newspaper man's shadow misbehaving badly fell across the doorway and O'Farrell took notice. He answered all Parkes' questions calmly and untruthfully. "Is there a Fenian plot in Sydney?" "Yes." "Who is the leader of it?" "Henry Parkes."

Parkes did get from O'Farrell a written confession of his own guilt and an expression of sorrow. This he waved round his head in Parliament and pretended to have in his hand a document which would startle the world; but he wouldn't read it. Pressed by William McLeay to do so he refused again and again, protesting that it was of too serious a nature to be given to the people in the then overwrought state of the public mind; whereupon McLeay drew a copy of the damaging document from his pocket and read it to the bewildered House. McLeay was not a Catholic, but all the McLeays were level-headed and just men. Parkes went frantic and threatened to sack every official at Darlinghurst, from Mr. Reid, the Jailer, to the last warder, for having supplied information to the outside world. Father

John Dwyer saved them from dismissal by confessing that it was he who, visiting O'Farrell as chaplain, had heard of the plot and procured an exact duplicate of the paper that was handed to Parkes. He lost the chaplaincy.

Father* John, a one-time Bungendore altar boy, was educated at Lyndhurst, became a Benedictine and was ordained in 1857. After terms at St. Mary's and St. Benedict's, he was made President of Lyndhurst, and continued so till the college was closed by Archbishop Vaughan. "No Lyndhurst boy ever had a word to say against the kindly Father John." He was a man of imposing, gentlemanly bearing with a frank and manly manner and a winning smile which made everyone his friend. After the closing of Lyndhurst he officiated as pastor of Five Dock and Druitt Town, and was made Dean of St. Anne's. Revered by everyone for his charity and cleanness of heart, he served there for five or six years and died at the residence attached to The Rosebank Convent. He was attended in his last moments by Father Callaghan McCarthy, of Concord, who had been at Mudgee for many years, being succeeded there by Monsignor O'Donovan in 1867. Father Callaghan McCarthy began the old Church at Mudgee in 1852. Previously, from Hartley he had attended all the north-west beyond Coonamble. His end was tragic, being scalded by escaping steam in a telescoped carriage in the railway smash at Redfern in 1893.

One of the outstanding Catholics of the early days was John O'Sullivan, to whom reference was made above. Readers of our Church history have frequently seen his name quoted in letters given by Cardinal Moran, Dom Birt, Dr. Eris O'Brien and Father McGovern. He was the sturdy support and trusted friend of bishops and priests from Father Therry and Archbishop Polding down to Dr. Lanigan's time. His home was an open house to the early priests, and how welcome must it have been when there were so few such in the whole country. Archbishop Polding always stayed with him, and so did Fathers Therry, McEncroe, and Abbot Gregory, while frequent callers dropping in to bid the time of day were John Fitzpatrick, Michael Brennan, Charles Lovat, Michael McGrath, Richard Walsh, Jerome Keating, Michael and John Kavanagh, T. D. Darcy, McAlroy and Bermingham. It was a happy meeting ground with so much of the past to talk about and Mary of the Mountains an immediate link, so much of the present and the future in a new country, with John O'Sullivan the reliable supporter and trusted adviser, and his young

wife about the place proud of the company and busy about everybody's comfort.

John O'Sullivan, as has been said, came to Sydney in 1828 with John and Peter Dwyer, and lived for six or seven years with Father Therry. In 1834 he was a teller or accountant in the Bank of Australia, which went out in the depression of 1843. About 1836 he began a merchant's business of his own in Goulburn, which appears to have had a money-lending branch attached to it. The following year he was appointed agent for the Commercial Bank, which was beginning to spread its branches into the country. About this time he married Bridget and settled down for his long residence of thirty years in Goulburn. He was a man of substance, owning some station properties on the Lachlan, and having interests in many other concerns; so much so that when the Commercial Bank closed in the slump of the 'forties he ran a bank of his own, and many a struggling beginner owed his success in life to the kindly assistance rendered by this good man. There was also a sterner side to his character which turned up where there was humbug. A chronicler of the time records that a Guy Fawkes procession was doing very well till O'Sullivan darted out of the bank and broke the effigy over their heads. Also in the early 'forties, just before the Commercial closed down, there was a whisper that the bushrangers were planning an attack on the bank; but nobody was unduly alarmed because it was no secret at all that J.O.S. was the possessor of a hefty blunderbus which he would have no scruples in using. The robbery did not take place. When the Commercial resumed business in 1853, after nine years' recess, he was appointed manager and continued so till the end of the 'sixties when he retired and went to live at Hunter's Hill. He had a family of two daughters and one son. One of the daughters died at Young at a very advanced age, while the son was among the famous "Twelve Apostles" whom Dr. Bermingham took with him to Ireland to study for the priesthood in 1861, and who, after adding many grey hairs to the heads responsible for the good conduct of Carlow College, returned to their native land with exactly the same number of sacraments as they had when they left it.

Outside the clerical circle John O'Sullivan was Father Therry's closest friend. The friend as well of every priest who worked in Goulburn during his residence there, his name figures large in every donation list connected with the building-up of the Church in that dis-

trict. He was one of the movers in the bringing of the nuns to Goulburn—the first Sisters of Mercy to arrive in New South Wales. He gave £420 towards the scheme and was instrumental in procuring the old bank premises as their residence till the first part of the Convent was ready to receive them. In passing, another benefactor of the sisters in their days of struggle should be noted—Émmanuel, a Jew, who kept their current account healthy till they were able to fend for themselves.

John O'Sullivan died in 1870 and his wife in 1878, both being buried beneath the '98 monument at Waverley. Their obsequies, especially those of Mrs. O'Sullivan, furnished a striking illustration of how the Australian Church had grown even in one lifetime. She had knelt as a child on the hard street before the cottage where Father O'Flynn had left the Blessed Sacrament. Her immortal father with Lacey of Penrith, Byrne of Campbelltown, Kenny of Appin, were among the number who had kept perpetual watch before it. She and her husband had seen the heroic single-handed efforts of Father Therry. They had seen other labourers come to share the work and had entertained and encouraged them in their hospitable home in Goulburn; and here around her coffin at St. Mary's were Fathers Collingridge, Fitzpatrick, Henze, Taylor, Forde, P. Bermingham (Wagga), P. Slattery (Cooma), Jerome Keating, Garavel, P. J. Mahony, J. Dwyer, J. Dalton, S.J., William Kelly, S.J., Hayes, Jolie, Muraire, Placid Quirk, Young and others. "New men, strange faces, other minds" for the most part. So few among them of the bygone days of youth and courage. The old Archbishop, Fathers Therry and McInerroe, and Abbot Gregory all gone, Michael Brennan, too, at rest in the flower garden at St. Nicholas', Penrith; Charles Lovat, in the Devonshire Street God's Acre; Michael McGrath, gone from the country; Richard Walsh asleep among his own at Bally-bricken; Michael Kavanagh at Roscommon, his brother, John, beside him; McAlroy a sick man at Albury. Dr. Lanigan officiated at the grave; Dr. Bermingham was there from Wagga; Jerome Keating, soon to end his days in a monastery in France; her nephew, Father John; and the only link with the 'thirties and the 'forties, John Fitzpatrick, of Melbourne—an old man of sixty-eight, the Deacon at the Mass.

One might infer from all this that young McGrath's lot was cast in pleasant places, and to the above extent it was; but there was the other side as well. The district he had to cover embraced Maneroo

and Broulee; in short, it went from Goulburn to the sea, north of Moruya, then down the coast as far as Gippsland and back home through Cooma and the present Federal Territory. It was a tidy parish and he could have packed the whole of Waterford into a corner of it. Moreover, it was for the most part formidable hills and terrifying hollows. It contained the highest parts of the Dividing Range with the seemingly bottomless gorges and densely wooded spurs rising higher and higher till they end in the Kosciusko Mountains. He had the roughest bit of Australia to patrol, and if it were rolled out it would have been as big as Ireland. There were settlers in the valleys and over the hills where the tracks climbed higher than the highest mountain in the British Isles. For a long time it was thought impossible to bring any wheeled vehicle from Moruya to Monaro, and it was never done till 1841, yet in that year young Michael McGrath made his way on horse-back from Goulburn right through to Twofold Bay, where a whaling station had been established before the days of Ben Boyd. They were rough men these, and rough, too, were the dwellers in the hills whom Father McGrath brought back to the practice of their religion; and he had rougher still to meet—the bushrangers.

Every country has had its highway men, but small bands of escaped prisoners hunting in packs for plunder or revenge—sometimes for their mere preservation—is a chapter peculiar to our own. Convicts endeavouring to make their escape from the barbarous system which enthralled them, and from the inhuman cruelty of individual masters, had taken to the bush from the beginning. They usually had a short life and an exciting one. The police were empowered to shoot at sight. Magistrates had, or presumed to have, extraordinary powers by which the death sentence might be passed for stealing, and the terrors of the chain gang inflicted for absence from work. These sentences were carried out in a way well calculated to instil fear into the hearts of others. Vengeance and terror were the supports on which the system rested. For stealing from his dwelling Major Mudie had five men hanged from the limb of a tree on the road between Maitland and Singleton, and the bodies were left swinging in a gale which tossed them to and fro and entangled their several ropes in a mad, fantastic dance of death. On Governor Burke's first visit to Goulburn Plains his humanity was shocked at the sight of hundreds of crows feeding on the bodies of Mooney and White, who were hanged somewhere near the place where the Passionists' Monastery, "Mary's Mount," stands

to-day.' Whitton, the bushranger, who was executed for the murder of John Kennedy Hume (brother of the explorer) at the sticking-up of Grosvenor's Homestead at Gunning, was accorded a ghoulisn procession to his death. Sentenced in Sydney, he was driven to Goulburn, chained hand and foot, and sitting on his coffin in a cart where he had as vis-a-vis the hangman, Green—a bad-looking fellow all pock-marked and knock-kneed."³ A most inspiring companion. Six mounted troopers rode beside, and in the rear was a second cart carrying the scaffold and gear. He was attended at the last by Dean Sowerby, C. of E., and 400 persons of both sexes watched his death struggles with keen but light-hearted interest. For another twenty years public executions afforded entertainment for those so minded, and as late as 1859 Father Jerome Keating, assisted by Carolan, the schoolmaster, attended Scrubby Jack on the grim stage, and when the hangman bungled his business a crowd of 200 made bright remarks—as at a football match—while the strangling man writhed in agony. Before the bolt was drawn the condemned man had pitifully implored Father Keating to find and save his son who had taken up with a tribe of blacks. The search was not successful.

Towards the end of the 'thirties and the early 'forties there was a recrudescence of convict bushranging and many a good citizen was robbed of his money and his horse if it were worth taking. Even the clergy of the time hadn't the privilege of right of way. Father Lovat was held up by Doherty, or Doughty, at Geary's Gap, near Lake George, in his first month of Colonial experience at Goulburn in 1839. He was commanded to hand-over with the persuasion of a levelled gun. Father Lovat dared the man to fire, and the bushranger, seeing that he was a priest, let him go. Doherty was a desperate character, perhaps a lunatic, and his arrest was ultimately effected with the greatest difficulty. Dean Sowerby and Father McGrath were bailed up on the same day by Jacky Jacky. The report says that the Anglican Minister was robbed by the villain, but it does not say whether or not McGrath suffered likewise. Perhaps the Roman Catholic Priest was not worth the trouble.

There were many such on the highways at the time, playing the lone wolf or hunting in packs, but this story for the moment is concerned with two—William Westwood, who was known as Jacky Jacky, and Britt, who traded under the name of Paddy Curran. The

³McAlister.

former was the most colourful of the whole long line, with perhaps the exception of Ned Kelly, while the latter shares with Lynch and Morgan the distinction of having been the most callous. Jacky Jacky was transported from England for a petty theft when he was a boy of seventeen, and was assigned to Phillip Gidley King (grandson of Governor King and afterwards the first Mayor of Tamworth), at Gidleigh, near Goulburn. He had his mind on higher things at the beginning, and read widely, acquiring a good working knowledge of English and the vocabulary of an educated man. When about twenty years of age he took to the bushranging with Paddy Curran, whose brutal instincts disgusted him and very soon the partnership was dissolved with violence. Paddy Curran committed rape and sometimes murder while Jacky Jacky confined his activities to robbery, sticking up wayfarers and mail coaches, and plundering wayside stores. Always well dressed, he did things in the grand manner, bowing low to the ladies and addressing consoling, well-worded speeches to the gentlemen in the waiting list. His working district extended from Braidwood to the City, and so well was he mounted on stolen thoroughbreds that he was able to attend to business at places miles apart in the course of a few hours. He even visited Sydney and entertained lavishly at a leading hotel while the police were out looking for him round Queanbeyan. On January 13, 1841, when following his calling at Bungendore, three local men went forth to apprehend him, but the bushranger was getting the best of it when young Michael McGrath, driving past in his gig, hopped out and, as the saying goes, "hopped in." Boxall tells the story⁴: "Mr. Balcombe and the Reverend Mr. McGrath drove up in a gig from the other side, and Mr. McGrath jumped down and presented his gun. Jacky Jacky, seeing himself surrounded, surrendered. On the way to Sydney he escaped from custody at Bargó, and gave himself another six merry months when he was again taken and sent to Cockatoo Island. There he organised a band of 28 prisoners in a desperate attempt to get away, but no one had ever absconded from Cockatoo Island. He was transported to Van Diemen's Land but got out of Hobart Town Gaol and resumed his old way of making a living. With the aid of black-trackers—Jimmy Hamilton and Burra Burra Jimmy—sent from Goulburn, he was finally apprehended and sent to Norfolk Island. Up to this he had not taken human life.

Paddy Curran or Britt was condemned to be hanged at Berrima for

⁴Australia's Bushrangers. .

murder and rape. Father McGrath tried to bring him to the state of grace, but was met with reproach and blasphemy. He persisted, and brought Father Goold up from Campbelltown, whose gentile ways with the sinner had never failed. Curran repelled them both and Goold went home defeated. However, on the night before the execution McGrath went again to the condemned cell and at last wore down the obstinacy of the bushranger who went to his death next day penitent, with the young priest at his side.

With all these distractions on his mind Young Michael McGrath nevertheless set about the building of two churches, one at Goulburn, and the other at Bungonia, about twenty miles away. In 1840, because there was some proselytising going on at Berrima, Dr. Polding brought Father Goold there to give a mission which turned out very successful. Leaving Goold at his work, the Bishop went on to Goulburn and, after saying two Masses in a bark church, which McGrath had run up, pointed out to the people the necessity of providing a more suitable place for the celebration of the Divine Mysteries. The next day he went on to Bungonia and made a like appeal. The Bungonia people were the first to move:—

“On last Sunday immediately after the celebration of Divine Service a meeting of the Catholics of Bungonia and the adjoining district was held at the house of Mr. G. G. Lynch for the purpose of raising subscriptions for the erection of a Catholic Church. The Reverend Mr. McGrath was in the chair. There was not as large a meeting as was anticipated owing to the unfavourable state of the weather, but from the spirit that actuated those who did assemble I have no doubt but that a church will soon be in progress. The Rev. Mr. McGrath, in calling the attention of the people to the desirable object for which they had assembled, spoke at some length upon the necessity of subscribing as largely as possible, observing that now we ought to avail ourselves of the aid of our religion as we were wont to do when at home. He also pointed out that by our united energies some suitable building might be raised which would do honour to the Catholics of the district and be a lasting memorial of their piety and zeal. Mr. McLennan spoke for some time describing the beautiful churches which he had the pleasure of seeing at Home raised by the weekly and monthly subscriptions of the working people, drawing the inference that the inhabitants of this district should subscribe rather handsomely from the difference of their positions from that of those he had alluded to. Mr. Lynch called the attention of those who kindly gave their names on a former occasion to come

forward and deposit what they had promised, remarking that the amount of the list he held in his hand, combined with what they were subscribing that day, would make a very respectable sum and be a strong inducement to others to subscribe. After trustees had been appointed and collectors named for the purpose of carrying the resolutions into effect, a vote of thanks was moved to the Reverend Mr. McGrath for his able conduct in the chair. The meeting then separated.”⁵

Father John Fitzpatrick in the previous year had said Mass at Lynch's and at Mrs. O'Donnell's Victoria Inn, but it was Father McGrath who made the first move towards the building of the Church at Bungonia. Even before the meeting reported above, he had been busy throughout his large parish gathering funds for the project. He continued to scour the whole country and by June 14th, 1841, he had in hand £349/2/6. This was subscribed by 150 donors with no large amounts on the list but many small ones, among which was one from “three poor travellers who, having been frequently attacked by bushrangers, cheerfully subjoin all that is left—twelve and sixpence.” For the Goulburn project he collected £343/6/2 from 200 subscribers.⁶ Added to the above was an amount he received from the people of Maneroo for the joint enterprise, for which neighbourly act “the people of Goulburn, Bungonia and adjoining districts express their thanks to the people of Maneroo for the handsome sum donated to these churches now in course of erection, and hope ere long to be called upon to do the same for them.” Although enough of the building was erected to warrant its use, the edifice was not complete when Father McGrath was removed from the district in 1843. In 1844, at Dr. Polding's first visit to the locality, after his return from abroad, the parishioners pointed out to him that although between £400 and £500 had been already spent on the Church it was still incomplete, and prayed His Grace to bring influence to bear on His Excellency to provide funds to carry out the remainder of the work.⁷ The last step was undertaken in 1847 when Father Richard Walsh replaced Father Michael Brennan as pastor of Goulburn:—

“Tenders will be called to proceed in the erection of the Catholic Churches at Queanbeyan and Berrima, and steps will also be taken to complete the Church at Bungonia.” (“The Sydney Chronicle,” July 3, 1847).

⁵“Australasian Chronicle,” Oct 18, 1840.

⁶Australasian Chronicle.

⁷Petition at Bungonia to Archbishop Polding.

St. Michael's, Bungonia, is one of the few churches on the century mark in Australia which stand to-day as they were built. It is Father Michael McGrath's only memorial in the country, and though he was not in the parish to see its completion, still his was the inspiration which began it and his the wearying preliminary ground-work which brought it into being.

His efforts to build a Church in Goulburn were begun with similar enthusiasm and ended in more or less the same way. Father Therry had frequently said Mass in that town probably as far back as 1825. At all events he was officiating there in Mat Healy's stables from 1833. There was a brick cottage in which he lived and used as a chapel. Father John Fitzpatrick did likewise for a year or so, but because it was getting too small for the congregation Father McGrath erected a church of stringy bark—a big affair able to accommodate the whole congregation which numbered 149 all told. It was this caboose which Dr. Polding condemned as unsuitable, and Young Michael McGrath, with all the enthusiasm of his twenty-four years of life, and one whole year on the Mission, proceeded to put up something worth while when the Bishop was away in Europe. He got Father Therry, then V.G. of Van Dieman's Land, but back for a spell in Sydney, to come along to lay the foundation-stone. He advertised it well, the "*Australasian Chronicle*," July 3rd, 1841, announcing "The Rev. Mr. Therry proceeds to the South to-day to lay the foundation-stone of a new church at Goulburn on Monday next, the feast of St. Vincent de Paul." He induced Father Goold, of Campbelltown, to join them, and the stone of St. Vincent's Church was laid with due ceremony. But even beginner's luck was not with him. The day turned out to be one of the coldest of the year, and Goulburn in July begs nobody's pardon. The site had been given by the Government in 1833 for church purposes. It was on the top of an almost inaccessible hill, the closest place to Heaven that could be found in the whole locality. The bleak westerly wind froze the devotion and the enthusiasm out of everybody, and when the whole thing was over the young man from Waterford had the dissatisfaction of hearing on all sides that no one wanted to climb that hill ever again. There was nothing to do but forget about it for the time. Governor Gipps was to pay a visit to the district in the near future, and McGrath bided his time. When the Governor came along the next year the whole population of the town was out at the races—"all the local clergy being present!" said the innocent news-

paper man whom the clergy have their reasons for regarding as a foe. But what about it? It was one hundred years before the Fourth Plenary Council of Australia put norma 54 in its decrees. The big event of the day was a wager of £100 for a race of five miles between two of the fastest horses in the district. Could an Irish heart be quiet? At the news of the Governor's arrival everyone hurried back to town, but His Excellency, being indisposed, went straight to his room at Captain Rossi's home, "Rossiville." On his appearance next day they gave him a great entertainment, among the chief items of which was the roasting of a bullock outside Mandleson's Hotel. During a lull in the festivities young Michael McGrath took possession of the Governor and tramped him up that hill to let him see for himself what a failure it was as a church site. Gipps was convinced and allowed himself to be led by the enthusiastic young priest round the town to see if a more suitable spot could be found. Then the correspondents—the predecessors of "Disgusted," "Pro Bono Publico," "Mother of Ten" of our own time—got busy in the papers, the Catholics drawing everybody's attention to the fact that the Anglican community had four or five acres in a good position and that their Minister had forty acres adjoining the town. They were careful to point out that they only mentioned this to show that if the Church of England people had been so well treated the Catholics were entitled to some consideration, and that they did not wish in any way to prejudice the position of the clergyman referred to. They were sincere in this for the Rev. Mr. Sowerby, who had been in the place since 1836 (and as Dean Sowerby lived there till 1875), had always shown himself to be a broad-minded and charitable man; and so he continued to be, being associated later on with Father Michael Brennan in many movements towards the alleviation of distress, and later still with Father Richard Walsh in similar acts, notably a fund for the relief of the victims of the Irish famine.

Gipps, too, was well disposed. He was much misunderstood during the term of his administration, and there were loud-spoken opinions for and against him, but as far as his dealings with the Catholic Body is concerned, it is significant that on his departure Abbot Gregory had a "likeness" of him done in oils which he presented to the Assembly. Gipps promised to see what could be done in the matter of the site, but after Father McGrath had left the parish and Father Brennan was sent along to build a church in Goulburn, a block of ground was

bought from Cornelius O'Brien, of Yass (brother of "Black Harry," of Douro), whereon the first St. Peter and Paul's was begun in 1843 with funds collected by McGrath on the windy day, and on other hard and weary days during his brief pastorate. This was finished in 1847 by Father Richard Walsh, and blessed by Archbishop Polding. Dr. Lanigan was consecrated in it in 1867—the first time a bishop in Australia was consecrated in his own diocese. While it was still being used the present St. Peter and Paul's Cathedral was built around it in the 'seventies, and when the job was completed the old church associated with the pioneer names of McGrath, Brennan, Walsh and Archbishop Polding was wheeled out the door, and a new era began. The unsuitable site on the windy hill was afterwards exchanged for the allotments on which the Convent of Our Lady of Mercy now stands. On it for many years the foundation-stone of the Church of St. Vincent de Paul, laid by Father Therry in 1841, stood as a pathetic reminder of a cherished hope that was never realised. It was used as a boundary mark between East and West Goulburn. It would be regarded to-day as a valuable relic, but no one knows what became of it. The last heard of it was in a police court case where it figured as evidence in a prosecution for trespass against the owner of a herd of wandering goats.

Father McGrath seemed destined throughout his church-building ventures in Australia to have the hard, uninspiring task of digging the trenches and laying down the substructure but never the satisfaction of putting on the coping stone. "*Sic vos, non vobis ...*." A truly zealous man need not care, but yet it is sweet to see one's tiny twigs of effort blossom into results. It is sweet, too, perhaps, to see one's name engraved on the completed work after the toiling. He was not so blessed. Still the storied tablet could not have been set in its place without the unremembered workman who laid the base. And that is about the extent of the lustre that is his. In the winter of 1843, he was transferred to another field:—

"We understand that the Rev. Mr. McGrath, R.C. Priest, is about to be removed from this district. The community over which he presided will lose an exemplary pastor, and the needy of every creed a benevolent friend. He laboured both far and near for nearly four years, and leaves the locality with the fervent prayers of a devoted people hoping that his future appointment will be such as he can exercise his talents and be of benefit to his bodily health." ("S. M. Herald," April 21st, 1843).

He was given a testimonial of £29 by the people of Bungonia; and the

appointment which it was hoped would be such "as he can exercise his talents and be of benefit to his bodily health" was Norfolk Island.

Norfolk Island, so long known as "The Hell on Earth," was the place to which the incorrigible prisoners were ultimately transferred, and at this time it numbered amongst its 1,800 inmates many of the notorious bushrangers, chief among whom was Father McGrath's old Goulburn contemporary, Jacky Jacky. For a few years it had been the locale of an experiment in the treatment of convicts which had been warmly advocated by Alexander Maconochie, and was entrusted to him in 1838. A humane man and a leading thinker in prison reform, Maconochie, when private secretary to Governor Franklin, of Van Dieman's Land, had attacked the convict system and denounced it as brutal and demoralising. "Human Nature cannot be broken across," was his phrase. He began by abolishing the method of feeding the prisoners as though they were animals at a trough. Each man was given his own utensils—plate, cup, kettle, etc.—made of tin, certainly, but something that the individual might have exclusively for his own use. He allotted to every man a little plot of ground where he might grow potatoes and other vegetables. He established a reading-room replete with books among which were some of a primary elementary educational kind such as Arithmetic, Technical Science, etc., and in these the prisoners took much interest—Jacky Jacky especially devoting his time to the mastering of mathematical problems. Furthermore, Maconochie introduced a system of marks for industry and good behaviour by which a convict might shorten his sentence.

Though the island had been established as a British Settlement as far back as 1788 and as a Penal Settlement in 1825, not one foot of building had been erected as a place for divine service. What service there was was held "in an old barn elegantly decorated with cobwebs and enlivened by the dulcet noise of rats and mice, or in the prisoners' mess-rooms redolent of the smell of tobacco and festooned with nets replete with potatoes, onions and cabbages suspended round the walls. This description is true to the minutest detail." ("Australasian Chronicle," July 7th, 1840).

Up to Maconochie's time there were really no chaplains as such, someone from among the convicts being selected to read the prayers. Before the arrival of Father McEncroe and Abbot Gregory this service for the Catholics was carried out by one who had studied for the priesthood, and he, as well as those of the other denominations, used

to drone away for two hours—of course, by regulation. In 1840 Maconochie erected two chapels, one for the Catholics and one for the non-Catholics, and this was used against him later on. He was adjudged to have failed in his scheme and was relieved of his commission in 1844. It was charged against him that his ideas were too expensive. He had increased the cost per prisoner to the Government from £10/18/4 to £13/3/11 per annum, and, of course, £2/5/7 a year, or 1½d. per day, was too much to pay for a fallen man's reformation. The expense was trivial when compared with the money that had been squandered to make the place a Hell on earth:—

“The Government House, the two military barracks, the commissariat stores, the prisoners' compound, etc., may vie with any buildings in Her Majesty's Dominion in respect to their relative purposes. The stone and mortar expended on the new gaol which has been in the course of erection for the past four or five years would be sufficient to build a church as large as St. Paul's, London. . . . Hitherto everything seemed to be carried on for the incarceration and the laceration of the body convict, the kindred spirit as far as any place fitted for the Service of God was concerned was left to feed on the desert air.” (“Australasian Chronicle,” 1st August, 1840).

It was charged against Maconochie that his leniency, the “plum-pudding policy,” as it was called, had been the cause of riots. There were riots during his regime, but they were not as numerous or as violent as heretofore; and certainly there had been no instances of what was not unusual earlier, when men had cast lots to see who should murder the other so that the bludgeon and the subsequent hangman's rope might put two lives out of earthly misery.

It was charged against Maconochie that gambling and immorality had taken the place of the old crimes of violence. No doubt these vices were there, as it is true that they will always appear among men who are herded together in numbers away from the ordinary refining amenities of society. Religious influence and that exerted from the earliest years is the only corrective. Maconochie had to deal with criminals hardened through many years of debasement, and new batches were constantly arriving. The chaplains were all too few and the time allowed for his experiment altogether too short.

Finally, it was charged against him that he spent too much time in the development of his theories to the neglect of practical administration. There was something in this, as was evidenced later on in England when he was appointed Governor of the new Birmingham

Gaol; and if it were so, he is not the only man in history who was capable of evolving good ideas but lacking the practical turn of mind to carry them into effect.

The cold truth is that Maconochie was doomed to fail before he began. There was a large force in control in England who could think of prison confinement in no other terms than those of the lash and the iron manacle. There was a band in Australia, too, who saw their jobs and their chances of making a fortune from side issues going out if he succeeded. Between them they brought about a return to the old vindictive prison code, and on February 7th, 1844, he was replaced. There was really nothing against him except that as a Governor of a gaol he was one hundred years before his time.

Father McGrath served some months with him in 1843 when the humane experiment was coming to a close. He was there, too, the next year to see the demoralisation setting in under Major Childs. He seems to have taken a special interest in the bushrangers (perhaps from old association) in their worsening conditions, and was instrumental in getting them in touch with Father Therry at Van Dieman's Land to whom they poured out their troubles as to a father. Father Therry was powerless and Childs kept on robbing the prisoners of their privileges one by one. The potato plots were dug up, the reading-room made out of bounds, the chains were bolted again on wrist and neck and ankle, and the old order returned with the clanking of irons, the thud of the lash on human flesh and the cries loud and revolting. During 1845, when arrangements for the transfer of the island to Tasmania were being made and the chaplaincy came under the control of Bishop Wilson, McGrath returned to Sydney—to Windsor. He had witnessed for eighteen months the deterioration setting in under Childs, but was spared the horrible sequel. This happened in July, 1846. Bit by bit Childs had cut out the privileges which Maconochie had allowed, and the last to go were the dining utensils. These were gathered in and when the men heard the rattle of the tins and realised what it meant, the way was cleared for murder. Jacky Jacky who, in all his escapades, had never taken human life, seizing a bludgeon, which was handy, constituted himself the leader and, followed by 1,600 of the 1,800 prisoners then on the island, stormed the barracks. Four warders were murdered—axes crashed through their heads and their bodies were hacked to pieces. The mob, out of control and bent on the slaughter of every officer in the gaol, surged wildly towards the

dwelling of Barrow, the Resident Magistrate. "Barrow, the Christ-killer," was the blasphemous battle-cry, but before they were able to add yet another murder the soldiers of the garrison, only 300 in number but disciplined and having muskets, drove them back to their quarters. Thirteen of the ringleaders were hanged, including Jacky Jacky and Lawrence Kavanagh. Jacky Jacky—William Westwood—was only 26 years of age.

Father McGrath remained at Windsor till August, 1847. He appears to have been destined to witness the macabre wherever he went. While at Windsor old St. Matthew's was broken into and it was his lot to find on coming home after a lengthy tour that his Church has been desecrated. He had a little more than two years there when he was succeeded by Father Therry. From Windsor he went to Bathurst with Father Vincent Bourgeois ("Chronicle," Aug. 18, 1847), who was appointed Dean. Thence he moved to Hartley where, with the help of Father Thomas Slattery of that centre, he collected £300 towards the building of a Church at Carcoar, the leading amount among the donations being £50. from Mr. Markham ("Chronicle," Oct. 2nd, 1847). In 1848 there were but three parishes in the Deanery of Bathurst, which covered an immense area—Bathurst, Rev. V. Bourgeois; Hartley, Rev. Thomas Slattery; and Carcoar, to the first charge of which Father McGrath was appointed. He made his residence at King's Plains and his work took him 200 miles along the Lachlan River. Until the Church was built there was no place in Carcoar suitable for the celebration of Mass except the Court House, and the Magistrates of the time were not inclined to let it for such a purpose; but with the old fire still burning Father McGrath bearded the lions on the bench and forced them to yield. He was the first minister of religion to so use the old Carcoar Court House, but the other denominations soon followed his example. He was the first priest to visit the goldfields at Ophir in the stirring times of 1852. But the Roaring days passed over and little permanent remained. Changed, too, is the scene of his work at King's Plains. A wheat field to-day covers the site where his humble Presbytery stood. In 1853 he left the district for Victoria and from there returned to his Native Land.

JOHN O'BRIEN.

Moral Theology and Canon Law

QUERIES.

PURPOSELY CONFESSING TO DEAF PRIEST; OBLIGATION OF HEARING MASS OUTSIDE SUNDAY; DOING LAUNDRY ON SUNDAY.

Dear Rev. Sir,

I. A person going fairly regularly to confession, deliberately chooses a confessor who, it is believed, is deaf. This is done in order to avoid a scolding which presumably would be given if the confessor could hear the matter confessed. The penitent admits being worried over these confessions but persists in the practice. What should another priest say if asked about the matter outside confession?

II. In a Bush district Mass is said only once a month and that on Saturdays. Some people refuse to attend on the plea that this is the only free day they have to do work about their own house and land (little vegetable gardens, etc.) Are they guilty of sin, grave or light? Can an obligation be imposed upon them, since they have no Sunday Mass? Also, how do they stand with regard to the Paschal Precept?

III. A girl works in a store situated quite close to her home. She works till 5.30 p.m., and has a half-day on Wednesday. It is a small district, and there is not much in the way of organized amusement. Is she justified in doing a little washing on Sunday on the plea that there is no other time to do it? She has no other house work to do as the other members of the family attend to this. Is she guilty of even a venial sin?

MICHAEL.

REPLY.

I. The person in question has every reason to be worried about his (or her) confessions. By divine precept we are bound to confess each and every mortal sin and, indeed, in such a way that they can be properly understood by the confessor. If, then, a penitent purposely chooses a deaf confessor so that his sins will not be fully understood, his confession is defective from the point of view of integrity, and is consequently invalid and must be repeated. Everything indicates that this is the position of the penitent of whom there is question in the present query. A deaf confessor is chosen "deliberately" so that the sins will

not be understood. The penitent might as well not mention the sins at all. Then he is evidently in bad faith, or at least positively doubtful faith, as he "is worried" over the matter. It is hard to see, therefore, how the confessions, and the communions too, made in such a state of mind can be other than sacrilegious, and there is every prospect that this deplorable condition is going to continue. It is evident that any priest, questioned on the matter even outside confession, is bound to say exactly how things stand. We wonder how anyone could have any doubts about his obligation. The divine precept of fraternal correction applies. Even a lay person would be bound in the circumstances. Of course, one must act prudently and not so frighten the sinner as to turn him altogether away from the Sacraments.

II. The Church commands the faithful to hear Mass on Sundays and holy days of obligation. The command has its roots in the natural law and the positive divine law. The natural law requires man to devote some of his time to the worship of his Maker. Similarly, it requires that men grouped in society should give God, the supreme Lord, the worship of public adoration which finds its most perfect expression in sacrifice. It is, therefore, necessary that men sometimes meet together in order to acquit themselves of this duty towards their God. Man could not but see this law written in his heart, and hence it is that from the remotest times man, even uncivilized man, offered sacrifice to the Deity. The Church, in imposing the obligation of assisting at Mass, but continues a tradition as old as humanity itself, and whose *raison d'être* is nothing else than the nature of man himself.

The positive divine law defined the obligation more precisely. Under the Old Dispensation, one day each week, the Sabbath, by command of God, was consecrated to divine worship, and on that day no servile work could be done. The Jewish ceremonial law ceased with the Old Testament. A new divine law concerning sacrifice was inaugurated with the command of Our Lord to His Apostles: "Do this in commemoration of me." The bloody Sacrifice of the Cross should be perpetuated in the unbloody Sacrifice of the Altar. Henceforth, the Mass will be the Sacrifice of the Church. And the Church, in imposing the obligation of assisting at Mass on Sundays and other holy days, merely interprets the law of Christ for the faithful, and defines for them in a concrete way when and how they are to obey His precept.

From the above it follows that the precept in question is a precept

of the natural law in as much as it requires that some time be spent in the worship of God by Sacrifice; in as much as it imposes a participation in the Sacrifice of the New Law, it is a precept of the positive divine law; and in as much as it fixes the Sunday and other holy days for the discharge of the obligation, it is purely an ecclesiastical precept. And from this it follows that, if a person cannot discharge his obligation in so far as it is imposed by the ecclesiastical law, he will still be bound by the precept in as much as it derives from the positive divine and natural laws. In other words, if a person can never be present at Mass on days of precept, he will be bound to hear Mass at least on some other days during the year. The theologians¹ do not attempt to be more precise than that. Therefore the people who are the subject of the present query, if they knew their theology, would not *per se* commit sin, either mortal or venial, when they refuse to go to Mass on Saturdays, provided they go at least a few times a year. We say *per se*, i.e. by reason of the ecclesiastical precept, because very likely they do commit sin because of their erroneous conscience through want of knowledge, or because of the real motives behind their failure to be at Mass.

As to the obligation of the Paschal Precept, we do not quite see the purpose of this query. A person can discharge this obligation any day of the week even outside Mass. But, since as a matter of fact these people will have facilities for satisfying their obligation on one, or at most two, days during the period within which the Paschal Precept binds, it will follow that they must take advantage of the priest's visit on a Saturday.

III. If the girl's statement that "there is no other time to do her laundry but Sunday" be really true, then she does not commit even a venial sin. And her statement might well mean something more than that the physical time was not available on any other day. However, generally speaking, people of this type are usually guilty of some venial fault in their failure to observe the Sunday law of rest. But, while we say this, we would immediately add that one must not be a rigorist or pharisaical in condemning small breaches of this law. When one recalls that theologians, generally, teach that a person would have to spend something between two and three hours in heavy work, such as ploughing or digging, before he would commit a mortal sin, he must

¹ *Vide* Vermeersch, Vol. III, p. 688; Noldin, Vol. II, 137; Davis, Vol. II, p. 64.

conclude that at most a very venial fault would be committed by the washing of a few garments, even though there were no particular excuse. And from this, too, he will conclude that if there be any reasonable cause it will excuse even from a venial sin.

*

*

*

*

PENAL SERVITUDE DOES NOT EXCUSE FROM RESTITUTION.

Dear Rev Sir,

Titius occupied a position of trust in a Public Hospital which is maintained partly by Government grant and partly by contributions from the neighbouring Shire Councils. An audit of his books revealed a deficit of some hundred pounds over and above the amount of Titius' fidelity bond. Court proceedings followed and Titius was sentenced to some years of imprisonment, the judge making no order for restitution. What are Titius' obligations with regard to restitution? Could it be argued in his favour that his obligation towards the Government was cancelled by his years of penal servitude, especially as no order against him for restitution was made by the trial judge? Further, could it be maintained that the money contributed by the Shire Councils was really taxpayers' money, and, as each individual taxpayer suffered so little loss as to be almost negligible, so too, Titius' obligation to restore is not *sub gravi*?

"MAC."

REPLY.

Titius is bound to restore the full amount—as far as he is able, it is understood. He appropriated what did not belong to him, and by the natural law, apart altogether from any ruling of the civil law, he is bound to give it back. *Res clamat ad dominum*. In reply to the specious arguments advanced in his favour, we would say:

(a) Re obligation towards the Government. Embezzlement of public funds, besides being a violation of commutative justice, is a crime against public law and order, punishable with gaol. This is the penalty Titius expiated by his years' penal servitude. But there remains the other natural obligation of satisfying commutative justice, and this obligation is discharged in one way and one way only—by giving back what he stole.

(b) Re obligation towards Shire Councils. Our correspondent will, we have no doubt, recall from his student days the oft inculcated

distinction between absolutely and relatively grave matter in theft, and how, when a certain limit is reached, the matter is grave and a mortal sin is committed even though no individual suffers any serious loss. The common good requires that there be such a limit; in other words the common good requires that a certain sum of money in all circumstances be regarded as absolutely grave matter from whomsoever it be stolen, be it from the very wealthy who do not miss it, be it from several individuals none of whom suffer a serious loss, be it from the Public Treasury itself. From this it follows, as a natural corollary, that the common good requires, too, that such misappropriated grave matter must be restored *sub.gravi*. And from this one can easily see how the bottom falls out of the argument advanced above in favour of Titius. For, even though the individual taxpayers have not suffered any great loss, still, in view of the common good, each one is *graviter inculpatus* at the theft, and would indignantly repudiate the idea that the thief is not bound to pay back what he stole. Moreover, it is not pertinent to this question to introduce a consideration of the injury done to the taxpayers. The theft is committed directly against the Shire Councils which are the real owners of the funds they administer, even though these funds are ultimately obtained from the taxpayers.

*

*

*

*

IS CATHOLIC UNDERTAKER JUSTIFIED IN ARRANGING CREMATIONS?

Dear Rev. Sir,

I would be grateful if you will kindly write a note on the following matter.

In my city parish a Catholic undertaker has for some years past arranged cremations for non-Catholics, as he considered that these people were not bound by the disciplinary laws of the Church. Recently, in advertising his business, he included the expression, "cremations arranged." Now, in reference to this, a discussion has arisen between my two curates. The junior maintains that the undertaker is gravely wrong and incurs the heavy penalties inflicted on those who encourage cremation. The senior curate says No. The Church does not intend her disciplinary laws to bind non-Catholics, and the undertaker can arrange cremations as far as they are concerned. He says that Catholics are certainly not scandalised thereby, and, to drive home his argument, he mentions, amongst other things, Catholic judges who

apply the divorce laws which conflict not only with the disciplinary laws of the Church but with the divine law itself. As pastor, I have been asked to settle the matter in dispute, and I shall be very grateful for your help.

PERPLEXUS.

REPLY.

We understand that in all our large cities undertakers generally, Catholics included, arrange cremations. This means that they notify the officials at the crematorium that they will have a body there for cremation at such an hour on such a date. They never take part in the actual cremation themselves. Consequently, they do very little more than if they were taking the body to the cemetery for burial, the only difference being that, instead of handing the body to the cemetery authorities, they consign it to the officials of the crematorium. In all this we cannot see anything more than material co-operation. Of course, if a particular undertaker were to go out of his way, and tried to promote or foster the practice of cremation amongst Catholics, or in a particular case, were to induce the relatives of a deceased person to have the body cremated rather than buried, then his co-operation would be formal. But the ordinary undertaker does nothing of the kind—in fact, the ordinary undertaker regards cremation as somewhat of a nuisance because of the additional trouble it involves for him such as the procuring of the certificates of two doctors. Granted, then, that the co-operation is material, it follows that it can be justified for serious reasons. And, in fact, the Holy Office, interrogated on the point, replied as follows on July 27, 1892: “Formal co-operation by advice or command is never lawful. Material co-operation can sometimes be tolerated provided (1) the cremation is not regarded as a distinctive sign or profession of adherence to the Masonic sect; (2) nothing connected with it solely and directly implies rejection of the Catholic teaching, or approval of the said sect; and (3) it does not appear that Catholics are compelled or invited to take part in contempt of the Catholic religion.” In our present-day society, the above conditions would normally be verified, and, consequently, since undertakers can hardly escape the performance of the task, they are justified. As one of them said to us: “We have to do it in our line of business; we simply take the body where we are told, and it is not for us to inquire into the religious beliefs or unbelief of our clients.” That sums up the whole position, and we see no reason why an undertaker should be

disturbed in his conscience over the matter.

Coming now to the actual case proposed to us, it appears that the question all revolves round the insertion of the expression, "cremations arranged," in this undertaker's advertisement. Now, it seems to us that if this expression is commonly used by undertakers in their advertisements, PERPLEXUS can give his decision in favour of the senior curate; but if it is something new, offensive to Catholics, or can be regarded by them as an invitation to have the bodies of their relatives cremated, or in any other way shows disrespect for the Church's stand in this matter—all unlikely contingencies enough—then the junior curate is perfectly right and is entitled to the support of his pastor in trying to have the offensive expression deleted from the advertisements.

In conclusion, as to the junior curate's statement that the "undertaker incurs the heavy penalties inflicted on those who encourage cremation," we would advise our correspondent, when he finds his young confrere in a confidential mood, to ask him what these heavy penalties are, as we never heard of them.

*

*

*

*

TWO PERSONS INVALIDLY MARRIED LIVING AS BROTHER AND SISTER; CAN SACRAMENTS BE GIVEN THEM?

Dear Rev Sir,

A divorced woman, her husband being yet alive, went through the formality of a civil marriage with another man. Of their union three children have been born. Both are now very repentant. They regret they cannot approach the Sacraments for their own sakes and also in order to give good example to the children who are being brought up religiously. Their concubinary status is not known in the locality where they are living, as nobody suspects anything wrong. Because of the children, they consider it impossible for them to separate, but they are prepared to separate *quoad torum*. Granted that the facts are exactly as I have outlined them, I'll be grateful if you will answer these questions: (1) Can I tell them they may live together in this way? (2) Can I absolve them and tell them to go to Holy Communion? (3) In the supposition that you answer in the affirmative, I would further ask: Should their irregular condition become public later, could I continue to give them the Sacraments?

ANXIOUS.

REPLY.

(1) There are occasions when two persons invalidly married might be allowed to live together as brother and sister. This happens in circumstances such as those outlined in the present query, i.e., when they are repentant but cannot separate either because of the inevitable loss of standing in the community where at present nobody suspects anything irregular in their matrimonial status, or, still more, because they have children. As a necessary condition it must be morally certain that their living together under the same roof does not involve a proximate occasion of sin for them. The Holy Office on March 8, 1900, gave a decision of this kind, on a case brought before it, which read: "In the proposed case, a *Sanatio in radice* cannot be granted. The parties therefore should separate immediately. Should this be morally impossible, let them live as brother and sister provided there be no danger of incontinence, and precautions are taken to this effect." Therefore, if our consultant is satisfied that the two persons he is interested in can be relied on really to separate *quoad torum*, as they promise, and live as brother and sister, he may tell them they may lawfully do so.

(2) As to the admitting of such a couple to the Sacraments, the principles involved can be found in any text book under the heading, "When the Sacraments are to be given or refused to persons in the state of sin or reputed to be in the state of sin." We can briefly recall them:—

(a) The Sacraments are to be refused to a secret sinner who asks for them privately. There is no need to tarry over this principle as it has no application in the present case, since we are led to suppose the parties will no longer be sinners.

(b) A secret sinner who asks for the Sacraments (e.g., Holy Communion) publicly, cannot be refused, as refusal in such circumstances would involve his public defamation, and have the effect, too, of, keeping others away from the Sacraments. For the reason mentioned under (a), it is evident that this principle, too, will not have any application in the solution of the present case.

(c) A public sinner must be refused the Sacraments whether he asks for them publicly or privately. The reason is evident. In the eyes of the public, this person is a sinner. Therefore, to refuse him the Sacraments does not defame him very much, seeing that *ex hypothesi* he is already publicly known to be unworthy of them. On the other hand, refusal would not scandalize the faithful—on the contrary, they

would be scandalized were a public sinner to be given the Sacraments. In dealing with the present case we shall invoke the aid of this principle as it may well happen that a person, though secretly and known to the priest worthy, may be in the eyes of the public a sinner and, consequently, in the eyes of the same public, unworthy of the Sacraments.

(d) A person who, to all appearances, is a sinner, but who is secretly known to be repentant, can be given the Sacraments privately.

From this last (d) principle, it follows that a person who is generally regarded as a public sinner could be given Holy Communion privately if the priest knows he is repentant and has made his peace with God. But, should there be question of a public Communion, something more will be needed, as is evident from principle (c). Such a person has given scandal. This must be counteracted in some way. In other words, something must be done to give reason to the faithful to believe that the past is regretted. Otherwise they would be scandalized at seeing a person, whom they rightfully regard as unworthy, admitted to the Sacraments. In the case of an ordinary individual who was commonly known to be leading a sinful life, the fact that he goes to confession publicly is normally sufficient reparation for his scandal and proof of his present good dispositions. But there are other public sinners of whom much more would be required. If, for instance, a man had written scandalous books, or attacked the Church and christian morals in the public press, such a one, no matter how repentant he may be privately, could not be admitted publicly to Holy Communion before he makes a public recantation. In the same way, a person, known to be living in a state of concubinage, could not be allowed to receive the Sacraments publicly before he removes the occasion of his sinful life. Public admission to the Sacraments in these cases, before public reparation is made for the sin, would be a source of serious scandal, since the faithful, especially the less instructed ones, would naturally conclude that they themselves will receive the Sacraments, too, even though they be unworthy of them.

With the aid of principles (c) and (d) we can easily enough answer our correspondent's questions. In the case he proposes, we notice several favourable aspects: The parties, despite their past weakness and sin, are evidently Godfearing; they acknowledge their fault and deplore it; they are careful of the religious education of their children; because of the same children, they find it impossible to separate completely, but they are prepared to separate *quoad torum*;

their irregular matrimonial condition is not suspected in their locality. This is all to the good, and we can immediately say, theoretically, that we see no reason why these two persons should not be admitted to the Sacraments—privately without any difficulty, and, in the supposition that things will continue in the *statu quo*, even publicly. We say this *theoretically* because, when one meets a case like this in actual life, he cannot but be impressed by two serious difficulties. On the one hand, there is the difficulty of forming a prudent judgment as to whether such persons are properly disposed. Proper dispositions for absolution include not only sorrow for the past but also a determination to avoid future relapse, and the taking of efficacious means to this effect. Now, can a confessor prudently persuade himself that the living under the same roof does not involve a serious and proximate occasion of sin for two who for years had been living as husband and wife? That is one difficulty. On the other hand, if such persons be allowed to receive the Sacraments publicly, how can a priest be other than apprehensive lest their great secret may leak out one day? Divorce, subsequent civil marriage, lawful husband yet alive, etc., are matters in themselves not secret. At the moment they are cloaked in secrecy, but who can say that one day sooner or later the whole affair will not become public? And if this should happen, how will the priest concerned explain away the fact that these people had been allowed to receive the Sacraments? Having drawn attention to these two difficulties, here are our replies to our correspondent's questions:—

(Absolution). In the supposition that the penitents are disposed, their absolution, at least in private, presents no particular difficulty. The Sacrament of Penance is a Sacrament of the internal forum where the confessor is concerned only with the internal dispositions of his penitent whom he can always, and whom *per se* he ought always, absolve if disposed, and this no matter how unworthy the penitent may appear in the eyes of the public. Of course, in forming his judgment, the confessor must take into account the above-mentioned serious occasion of sin, but it may well be that he finds his penitents naturally and supernaturally so strong in their determination that he can form a prudent judgment in their favour. If, however, they intend to go frequently and publicly to confession so that everyone must naturally conclude that they are receiving the Sacrament, then the point we make later with regard to public Communion, will apply also to their reception of the Sacrament of Penance.

(Communion). There is no difficulty, again, in giving them this Sacrament secretly. Were it known in the parish that they are not validly married, they could not be allowed to communicate publicly as is evident from what has been already said. The faithful would be scandalized. As a matter of fact, at present no one suspects their irregular condition, and, were it certain that this secrecy will continue, there would be no difficulty in allowing them here and now to communicate publicly. But our correspondent visualizes the possibility that the secret may leak out one day. The fact that he mentions this at all indicates that he must have some reason to apprehend its likelihood. And, of course, if the secret does get out, public reception of the Sacraments would have to cease forthwith. This, then, is the dilemma for the pastor, for if he admits them publicly to the Sacraments now, and, later, has to make a *volte-face* in the matter, he will be placed in a very awkward position before his parishioners. The whole question, then, is reduced to one of prudence—ought the pastor rather direct these persons to be satisfied for the time being with private reception of the Sacraments or, at least, that they would receive them in a parish where they are entirely unknown? The pastor himself, who is the only one *au courant* of all the circumstances, can answer that question. But, if he decides on allowing public reception, he should insist on such guarantees as will make him morally certain that the secret will be kept inviolably.

(3) We have already said what must happen if the secret gets out, i.e., if the parishioners generally get to know that these two who are living together, and have children, are not validly married. The pastor would have to cease giving them the Sacraments publicly. Otherwise, he would have to give his parishioners a detailed theological explanation of his casuistry, which would be morally impracticable. But, if they continue in their good dispositions, he could give them the Sacraments privately or, better still, let him advise them to provide for themselves in a parish where they are unknown.

JOHN J. NEVIN.

Liturgy

DEDICATION OF A CHURCH TO A BEATIFIED; CULT PERMITTED TO A BEATIFIED.

Dear Rev Sir,

I intend to build a new church when building restrictions are lifted. I wish to dedicate it to Blessed Oliver Plunkett. My objective will be to arouse popular devotion to him in every way possible, with a view to helping on the cause of this martyr's canonisation. Such an event could assist in strengthening the faith and courage of Catholics in any future difficulties.

(1) Will you kindly explain what particular difficulties are involved in having a "beatus" as patron of a church?

(2) Further, I have been given to understand that the cult of a "beatus" is more restricted than that of a canonised saint. Will you explain the nature of such restrictions, so that I may know to what extent they may obstruct my plans for arousing popular devotion?

PETRUS.

REPLY.

The first question of PETRUS is contained implicitly in the second, as the "difficulties" at which he hints in the former are part of the limitation of the public worship accorded to the Beatified, of which he enquires in the latter. For the sake of clarity, however, his questions are answered separately.

DEDICATION OF CHURCH TO BLESSED OLIVER PLUNKETT.

Neither churches nor altars may be dedicated to a Beatified, except by Apostolic Indult (Canons 1169, 3; 1201, 4). This regulation holds even in the case where the Mass and Office of the Beatified is permitted, so that no relaxation of the general law is implied by the fact that the celebration of the Mass and Office of Blessed Oliver Plunkett is granted to the dioceses of Australia.

It may be conjectured that a request for such an indult would, in the present case, be received sympathetically by the Holy See. For the cult accorded to this Beatified by special indult is of a more ample and generous character. Whereas it is usual to grant the Mass and Office of a Beatified only to the diocese or religious Order to which he belonged, the Office of Blessed Oliver may be said and his proper Mass celebrated annually in the various dioceses of Ireland and Australia

and in the churches and oratories of the Irish College or of other Irish Institutes in Rome.

NATURE OF BEATIFICATION AND CANONISATION.

To reply to the second question of PETRUS satisfactorily it will be convenient to indicate briefly the radical differences between beatification and canonisation. Beatification may be defined as an act by which the Church passes judgment on the sanctity or martyrdom and miracles of a Servant of God and, as a consequence, permits public worship of this Servant of God in a limited degree. Canonisation is an act by which the Church, after examining further the heroic character of the virtues or martyrdom and the miracles of a beatified Servant of God, issues a solemn and definitive declaration that he is numbered among the Saints of Heaven and, therefore, must be worshipped as such throughout the Church.

From a comparison of these two definitions the differences in the nature and effects of the two acts may be tabulated:

(i) Beatification is rather a preparatory act, a stage in the prosecution of a more ultimate goal; canonisation is the attainment of the goal, a final and definite act.

(ii) Beatification involves *permission* to accord public worship on account of established moral certainty of the beatitude of the Servant of God; Canonisation involves a *precept* to accord public worship because of sanctity proclaimed by a definitive—probably infallible—act.

(iii) Beatification permits a cult of *dulia*, limited in its nature and extent; Canonisation demands the full cult of *dulia* without any limitation.

LIMITED PUBLIC CULT OF THE BEATIFIED.

It should be observed in the first place, then, that the cult of beatified Servants of God is *public* worship, i.e., worship given in the name of the Church, by persons legitimately authorised and by acts instituted by the Church (Canon 1256). It differs, accordingly, from the *private* worship which may be offered to two other classes of Servants of God, namely, those who have died with a reputation for sanctity or those entitled Venerable (i.e., those Servants of God, the causes of whose beatification have been initiated and have reached a stage at which a decree has been issued by the Holy See, declaring authentically that their virtues in a heroic degree or their martyrdom have been proved). (Canons 2084, 2; 2115).

This public cult of the Beatified is, however, limited to certain acts of worship which can be offered only by certain persons and in certain places. It will be convenient to list the various acts by which public worship is accorded to the Saints and to note successively the limitations imposed in the case of Beatified Servants of God.

Public worship is given to the Saints—

- (1) by appointing a day on which their feast is celebrated;
- (2) by celebrating Mass and reciting the Divine Office on their feast day, in their honour;
- (3) by exhibiting their relics and images (statues and pictures) for public veneration;
- (4) by nominating them as titulars of churches or of altars, and as patrons of places or religious congregations;
- (5) by including their names in the Roman Martyrology; also in the calendars of churches or religious orders.

The cult of the Beatified involves some restriction in regard to each of these acts of worship—the restrictions being varied somewhat by Apostolic Indult in individual cases.

1. FEAST DAYS. The feasts of the Beatified (in the case of Blessed Oliver Plunkett, July 11th, the day of his martyrdom) may not be celebrated with an octave. Moreover, the day of his beatification may not be celebrated with an office. Neither may the Beatified be invoked in public prayers except in those permitted by the Holy See.

2. MASS AND OFFICE. The Mass and Office of a Beatified may be said only with express permission of the Holy See. This permission is granted only for a certain place (diocese or country) or for certain persons (e.g., a religious body), so that the Mass may be celebrated only in the churches and oratories of these places or persons. As already observed, the Apostolic concession in the case of Blessed Oliver Plunkett is particularly generous, being extended to the dioceses of Ireland and Australia and to the Irish College and other Irish Institutes in Rome.

It follows readily from the restricted character of the cult that votive Masses of a Beatified are not permitted. For, even though his Mass has been granted, the concession is made only for a particular day and cannot be availed of at other times.

3. RELICS AND IMAGES. Relics of a Beatified may be exhibited in those churches where the Mass and Office of the Beatified are

celebrated by permission of the Holy See. They may not be carried in procession, except by special indult. (Canon 1287, 3).

As PETRUS speaks of arousing greater popular devotion to Blessed Oliver, he will endeavour, no doubt, to acquire some relic of the Beatified. It may be useful to append some of the principal regulations concerning relics in general, whether of Saints or of Beatified. Only those relics may be honoured in churches with public worship, the genuine character of which is guaranteed by an authentic document from the hand of a Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church, or of the Local Ordinary, or of an ecclesiastic who has by Apostolic indult the faculty of authenticating relics (Canon 1283). When exposed, relics should be enclosed in cases and sealed (Canon 1287); lights should burn before them. Relics classified as "insignes" may not be preserved in private houses or private oratories without the express permission of the Ordinary (Canon 1282, 1). Such relics are the body, head, arm, forearm, heart, tongue, hand, leg or that part of the body in which a martyr suffered, as long as it is entire and not small (Canon 1281, 2).

Regarding images—statues or pictures—it is laid down, in application of the general notion of a restricted cult, that they may not be exhibited for veneration in churches or oratories without permission of the Holy See; if such permission is given it must be understood that the images are permitted on the walls but not on the altar. However, as in the case of relics, a consequence of importance follows from concession of the Mass and Office; in that case images and votive tablets may be exposed on the altar.

As in the case of relics, it is not permissible to carry the image in processions without a further indult.

5. **TITULARS AND PATRONS.** Neither churches nor altars may be dedicated to the Beatified without Apostolic Indult (Canon 1168, 3; 1201, 4). Similarly, the Beatified may not be named Patron of a country, diocese, province, confraternity, religious order, etc., except by Apostolic Indult. The fact that the Mass and Office has been permitted does not involve any concession in this regard.

6. **MARTYROLOGY AND CALENDARS.** The names of the Beatified may not be inscribed in the Roman Martyrology; they may be inserted in local calendars or in those of religious orders when the Office and Mass of the Beatified have been permitted.

JAMES CARROLL.

Book Reviews

"CHRIST'S HOMELAND" (by Rev. D. Riordan, P.P.) (Gill & Son.)

I often wished I could re-visit the Holy Land, if only it could be done without the inconvenience and unpleasantness of the journey. For the Holy Land is in the East, and the East has its very unpleasant side: I once described it as a land of smells, bells, and yells. My wish has been granted in the reading of Father Riordan's "Christ's Homeland."

Father Riordan is one of those travellers who has eyes to see and an imagination to enjoy and paint the scenes through which he passes. He has seen many things, certainly the best of what there is to see in Palestine, and he has the happy knack of taking his readers with him by his vivid and devotional descriptions of the people, places and scenes he visits.

It is a book that will be enjoyed by those who have had the happy privilege of visiting the Holy Land, for they will re-live those days when they felt the holiness of treading the very path their Saviour trod; it is a book which should be read by anyone who intends visiting that sacred land, for it will tell them what to make sure of seeing and how to see it; it is a book that should be read even by those who have not been, and never hope to visit those holy spots, for it will give them a vivid description of the scenes of the Gospel story. It is a book that will be enjoyed by all. I will give only one quotation; it is a sample of the style of the whole book:—

"I wonder if in any language there is a word as sweet as Galilee! The mere mention of that province raises up a mental picture of spring flowers, sunlit waves and gentle hills, while the soft cadence of such names as Magdala, Chorazain and Bethsaida sound like messages of love from the lips of the Saviour. 'Jesus of Galilee' is the most attractive of all Our Saviour's titles, and He was the most lovable personality that the world has ever known; the comrade of poor Peter and his humble companions, the favourite of village children, the hope of the sick and the afflicted, the Preacher of those beautiful parables that are still the wonder of the world.

"But when Our Saviour leaves Galilee and 'goes up to Jerusalem,' the harsh note immediately creeps into the Gospel, and Jesus, the

gentle Friend, gives place to Jesus, the tragic Victim. We unconsciously picture Him looking at His Cross from afar, advancing step by step into the power of His enemies, while the sunshine is fading over Galilee, and dark clouds are rolling up over Sion."

Such is the tone of the whole book of scarcely one hundred pages. I enjoyed every page of it, for in the scenes described the author makes Christ live, act, and speak again. To me, it was a re-visiting of the Holy Land, with all that was holy and beautiful, sitting in leisure in my library. To Father Riordan I say "Thank you" for "Christ's Homeland."

Our copy is from the publishers, Gill & Son.

J. M. C.

*

*

*

*

SOUL CLINIC, by Two Sisters of Notre Dame. Pustet & Co., 200 pp.

This book is described in its subtitle as "An Examination of Conscience for Religious Teachers." It is divided into two parts. The first is called "The Psychological Approach to our Spiritual Problems." The second and longer part of the book contains examinations of conscience for the greater feasts of the year. The prayers, examinations and resolutions are given at length. Prayers from a book must always be a matter of individual taste; but these are, at times, far too elaborate and artificial for anyone. Here, e.g., is the last paragraph of an act of contrition: "The more the human mind becomes penetrated with divine reality the more detached it will be from the phantoms of earthly living. All the make-believe of human pleasure and greatness appears for what it is—emptiness, illusion, shadow. But the panorama of the supernatural takes on new allurements. The soul hungers and thirsts for the Infinite, until, renouncing for ever all that ends with time, the emancipated spirit finds everlasting rest in the Eternal. It has found everlasting fulfilment and happiness in the possession of You, my God."

The first half of the book is the more useful. It is an analysis of the spiritual life in terms of modern psychology. Indeed, it is somewhat overburdened with an unnecessarily technical vocabulary. To take but one example: it is hard to see what is gained by describing the concentration of effort achieved in the Particular Examen of Conscience as an avoidance of "the psychic weakness resulting from mul-

tiple disconnected complexes." (p. viii.). The authors, moreover, seem to believe that the first principles of ascetical doctrine were discovered by modern writers. "Father Hull says that the supernatural presupposes the natural." (p. 30). The Latin and Greek Fathers said so, too. "According to contemporary Catholic psychologists, notably Fr. Lindworski, S.J., both mind and heart present motives to the will; the mind presents intellectual, the heart emotional motives." (p. 1). The author of the Book of Genesis anticipated contemporary Catholic psychologists.

This part of the book contains a wealth of matter for self-examination by teachers. It is full, detailed and practical in its description of the spiritual life, its end, its difficulties, and the means of overcoming these. It concentrates with admirable emphasis on urging that the emotions be not suppressed but educated to serve us. The bibliography would be improved by the addition of the publishers' names and the dates of publication. V.M.

* * * *

CHRISTIANITY IN DAILY LIFE. By Henry V. Gill, S.J., M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., Dublin, 1942. Pp. 171. 3/6.

This book by Fr. Gill is a short outline of the fundamental doctrines of our Faith. It has not the formal divisions of a manual of instruction, nor does it set out to prove every point as a book of apologetics. The leading truths of the Faith are presented briefly and logically to deepen the foundations of love of God. Useful practical directions are given for daily life.

People who have left school behind and wish to refresh their knowledge of the Faith would, I think, find this book helpful. It meets the need both of the person who wants to take a view of the whole system and of the one who wants to think over something to inflame his heart with love of God. The brief treatment of the ideas leaves room for the thoughtful reader to apply them to himself in the way that best suits his own soul. Many of the paragraphs would supply solid matter for meditation. G.S.

* * * *

BOOKS RECEIVED.

From Robertson and Mullins, Melbourne:

Social Insurance and Allied Services. Report by Sir William Beveridge (3/7). Memoranda from Organisations; appendix to Report (3/7).

Pattern for Peace (1/-).

General Index

CONTENTS OF VOLUME XX.

ARTICLES.

Apostles of To-morrow (Rev. J. T. McMahon, M.A., Ph.D.) ..	205
Beveridge Report and Plan (Rev. W. Keane, S.J.)	217
Conversion of Non-Catholics (Rev. M. F. Toal, D.D.)	137
Forming Lay Leaders (Rev. W. G. Smith, S.J.)	146
In Diebus Illis I. (John O'Brien)	15
In Diebus Illis II. "	113
In Diebus Illis III. "	159
In Diebus Illis IV. "	238
Industrial Council in the New Order (F. K. Maher, M.A., LL.B.)	1
Jocelin of Brakelond and Medieval Monastic Life (Rev. T. Armstrong)	78
Lay Apostolate in the Forces (Rev. C. Mayne, S.J.)	92
Nature and Perfection of God (Rev. J. O'Rourke, O.P.) ..	65
Pastoral Visitation in City Parishes (Rev. B. O'Connor) ..	40
Priest and the Neurotic (S. J. Minogue, M.B., Ch.M.)	179
Richelieu, 1642-1942 (Rev. W. P. McDonagh, S.J.)	26
Sodality of Blessed Sacrament (Rev. W. A. Fox, S.S.S.)	103

MORAL THEOLOGY.

Betting Case	50
Confession, purposely made to deaf Priest	258
Confessor, occasional, of religious women	51
Cremations, is Catholic Undertaker justified in arranging? ..	262
Marriage, between affines in first degree of direct line ever possible	193
when children of mixed, bound to canonical form	187
invalid, can Sacraments be given to two persons living as brother and sister?	264
Mass, obligation of hearing outside Church or Oratory	45
obligation of hearing outside Sunday	287
when lawful to use fermented bread at	190

Restitution, penal servitude does not excuse from	261
Sunday, laundry on	287

LITURGY.

Antependium of altar	129
Baptism, solemn, in private house	55
Beatified, dedication of church to cult permitted to	269
Bination, Purification of Chalice	197
Blessing of Baptismal Font, if omitted vigil of Pentecost ...	200
Ciborium, veil of	127
Communion, distributing of, in black vestments	128
taken privately to sick in hospitals	130
Easter, calculation of	201
Feria, origin of word	60
Mass, once a week where Blessed Sacrament is reserved	57
Missa Quotidiana, order of prayers in	59
Monstrance, veil of	128
celebrant carrying for Benediction	196
manner of giving blessing at Benediction with	199
Patron's Feast, transfer of external solemnity	198
Rosary, mysteries to be said on Sundays	126
Tabernacle Veil, colour for private Requiem Mass	196

CORRESPONDENCE

REVIEWS OF BOOKS.

<i>All the Day Long</i> (Sargent) ..	64
<i>Chats with Converts</i> (Forrest) ..	203
<i>Christianity on Daily Life</i> (Gill)	275
<i>Christ's Homeland</i> (Riordan) ..	273
<i>Father John Sullivan</i> (McGrath)	63
<i>Mary of Bethlehem and other Poems</i> (King)	102
<i>Person of Jesus</i> (James)	132
<i>Praying with the Peverello</i> (Keiner)	204
<i>Soul Clinic</i> (Notre Dame)	274
<i>Story of Bishop Salvado</i> (McMahon)	135
<i>Things in me that make me a believer</i> (McEvoy)	77